arXiv:1405.4896v1 [math.PR] 19 May 2014

# Diffusion Limit For The Random Walk Metropolis Algorithm Out Of stationarity

**Michela Ottobre** [1] **Andrew M. Stuart** [2]

**Abstract:** The Random Walk Metropolis algorithm is a Monte Carlo-Markov Chain method which creates a Markov chain which is reversible with respect to a given target distribution with Lebesgue density on $\mathbb{R}^N$; it can hence be used to approximately sample the target distribution. When $N$ is large a key question is to determine the computational complexity of the algorithm as a function of $N$. One approach to this question, which we adopt here, is to derive diffusion limits for the algorithm. We work in the setting in which families of measures on spaces of increasing dimension are found by approximating a measure on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space which is defined by its density with respect to a Gaussian. We study the situation where the algorithm is started out of stationarity. We thereby significantly extend previous works which consider either only measures of product form, when the Markov chain is started out of stationarity, or measures defined via a density with respect to a Gaussian, when the Markov chain is started in stationarity. The result demonstrates that the the number of steps required to sample the target distribution scales as $\mathrm{O}(N)$, as is known to be the case for product measures, with the Markov chain started in or out of stationarity, and for non-product measures of the form considered here, with the Markov chain started in stationarity.

Primary 60J22; Secondary 60J20, 60H10

Random Walk Metropolis algorithm, diffusion limits, non-stationary Markov Chains.

## 1. Introduction

### *1.1. Setting and Main Result*

Metropolis-Hastings algorithms are popular MCMC methods used to sample from a given target measure $\pi$ defined via its density with respect to Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^N$ which, where there is no possibility of confusion, we also denote by $\pi$. The basic mechanism consists of employing a proposal transition density $q(x, y)$ in order to produce a reversible chain $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ which has the target measure as invariant distribution [Tie98]. At step $k$ of the chain, a proposal move $y_{k+1}$ is generated by using $q(x, y)$, i.e. $y_{k+1} \sim q(x_k, \cdot)$. Then such a move is accepted with probability

$$\alpha(x, y) = \min\left\{1, \frac{\pi(y)q(y, x)}{\pi(x)q(x, y)}\right\}.$$

[1] michelaottobre@gmail.com, Imperial College London, Mathematics Department, 180 Queen's Gate, SW7 2AZ, London

[2] a.m.stuart@warwick.ac.uk, Mathematics Institute, Warwick University, CV4 7AL, UK

If the move is accepted then the chain is updated to the state $x_{k+1} := y_{k+1}$, otherwise $x_{k+1} := x_k$. When the proposal kernel $q(x, y)$ is symmetric in its variables, the expression for the acceptance probability simplifies to

$$\alpha(x, y) = \min\left\{1, \frac{\pi(y)}{\pi(x)}\right\}.$$

Random Walk Metropolis (RWM) belongs to the family of Metropolis-Hastings algorithms with symmetric proposal, as the proposal move is generated according to a random walk. A key question for Metropolis-Hastings methods in general, and for RWM in particular, is to determine the computational complexity of the algorithm as a function of the dimension $N$; in particular, how many steps are required to explore the target measure, as a function of $N$? One way to do this is to demonstrate that the MCMC method has a diffusion limit and may be viewed as a time-discretization of this diffusion limit. The inverse of the effective time-step in this discretization provides a measure of the number of steps required to sample the stationary distribution.

The present paper aims at studying the complexity of the RWM algorithm by the use of diffusion limits. We study the situation where the algorithm is started out of stationarity and when the family of target measures are determined by approximations of a measure on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space by a family of measures on $\mathbb{R}^N$, for $N \to \infty$. In particular, we focus on the RWM algorithm to sample from a probability measure $\pi$ defined on an infinite dimensional separable Hilbert space $(\mathcal{H}, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, \|\cdot\|)$ and absolutely continuous with respect to a Gaussian measure $\pi_0$ with mean zero and covariance operator $\mathcal{C}$. Thus

$$\frac{d\pi}{d\pi_0} \propto \exp(-\Psi), \qquad \pi_0 \overset{\mathcal{D}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{C}), \tag{1.1}$$

for some real valued functional $\Psi$ with domain $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, $\Psi : \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \to \mathbb{R}$, where $\pi_0(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}) = 1$. In Section 3 we shall give the precise definition of the space $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ and identify it with an appropriate Sobolev-like subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ (denoted by $\mathcal{H}^s$ is Section 3). The covariance operator $\mathcal{C}$ is a positive, self-adjoint, trace class operator on $\mathcal{H}$, with eigenbasis $\{\lambda_j^2, \phi_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$:

$$\mathcal{C}\phi_j = \lambda_j^2 \phi_j, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{1.2}$$

and $\{\phi_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$. We will use the RWM algorithm with proposal

$$y = x + \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\xi^N, \qquad \xi^N = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \xi^{j,N}\phi_j, \quad \xi^{j,N} \overset{\mathcal{D}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1) \text{ i.i.d.}, \tag{1.3}$$

and we will start our Markov chain out of stationarity. The current position $x$ and the proposal $y$ belong to $\mathcal{H}$; however, because the noise is finite dimensional, effectively only the first $N$ components of $x$ are modified when a proposal is accepted, namely the components belonging to

$$X^N := \text{span}\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^N. \tag{1.4}$$

Throughout the paper we use the following notation: given a point $x \in \mathcal{H}$, $x^N := \mathcal{P}^N(x)$ the projection of $x$ onto the space $X^N$; $x^{i,N}$ will be the $i$-th component of the vector $x^N \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

i.e. $x^{i,N} = \langle \phi_i, x^N \rangle$ – notice that if $x^N = \mathcal{P}^N(x)$ and $1 \le i \le N$ then $x^{i,N} = \langle \phi_i, x^N \rangle = \langle \phi_i, x \rangle$. Similar notation is also used for $y, \xi$ and other vectors; we do not give details.

Using the proposal (1.3) we construct the Markov chain $x_k$ and consider the continuous interpolant

$$x^{(N)}(t) = (Nt - k)x_{k+1} + (k + 1 - Nt)x_k, \quad t_k \le t < t_{k+1}, \text{ where } t_k = k/N. \tag{1.5}$$

The main result of this paper is the diffusion limit for the RWM algorithm, which we informally state below, with $D_\ell, \Gamma_\ell$ and $A_\ell$ defined immediately after the statement. The rigorous statement of the result, with precise conditions, appears as Theorem 5.2.

**Main Result.** *Let $x_k$ be the Markov chain constructed using the RWM proposal (1.3). Assume that*

$$S_0 := \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\left| x_0^{j,N} \right|^2}{\lambda_j^2} \tag{1.6}$$

*is finite. Then for any initial data $x_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, the continuous interpolant $x^{(N)}(t)$ defined in (1.5) converges weakly in $C([0,T]; \tilde{\mathcal{H}})$ to the solution of the SDE*

$$dx(t) = [-x(t) - \mathcal{C}\nabla\Psi(x(t))] D_\ell(S(t))\, dt + \sqrt{\Gamma_\ell(S(t))}\, dW(t), \tag{1.7}$$

*where $S(t) \in \mathbb{R}_+ := \{s \in \mathbb{R} : s \ge 0\}$ solves the ODE*

$$dS(t) = A_\ell(S(t))\, dt, \qquad S(0) = S_0\,, \tag{1.8}$$

*and $W(t)$ is a $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$-valued $\mathcal{C}$-Brownian motion.*

Let $\Phi(x)$ denote the cdf of a standard Gaussian, and introduce the following real valued functions: for $x > 0$ and $\ell > 0$ a positive parameter, we define

$$D_\ell(x) := 2\ell^2 e^{\ell^2(x-1)} \Phi\left( \frac{\ell(1-2x)}{\sqrt{2x}} \right), \tag{1.9}$$

$$\Gamma_\ell(x) := D_\ell(x) + 2\ell^2 \Phi\left( -\frac{\ell}{\sqrt{2x}} \right), \tag{1.10}$$

$$A_\ell(x) := (1-2x) D_\ell(x) + 2\ell^2 \Phi\left( -\frac{\ell}{\sqrt{2x}} \right) = -2x D_\ell(x) + \Gamma_\ell(x) \tag{1.11}$$

and for $x = 0$ and $\ell > 0$ we set

$$D_\ell(0) = \Gamma_\ell(0) = A_\ell(0) = 2\ell^2 e^{-\ell^2}. \tag{1.12}$$

**Remark 1.1.** We make several remarks concerning the main result.

- Since the effective time-step implied by the interpolation (1.5) is $N^{-1}$ the main result implies that, started out of stationarity, the RWM algorithm will take $\mathcal{O}(N)$ steps to explore target measures found by approximating $\pi$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

- Notice that equation (1.8) evolves independently of equation (1.7). Once the algorithm (2.3) is introduced and an initial state $x_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is given such that $S(0)$ is finite, the real valued (double) sequence $S_k^N$,

$$S_k^N := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\left|x_k^{i,N}\right|^2}{\lambda_i^2}$$

(see also (5.10)) started at $S_0^N := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\left|x_0^{i,N}\right|^2}{\lambda_i^2}$ is well defined. If we define the continuous interpolant $S^{(N)}(t)$ of the chain $S_k^N$, namely

$$S^{(N)}(t) = (Nt-k)S_{k+1}^N + (k+1-Nt)S_k^N, \quad t_k \le t < t_{k+1}, \text{ where } t_k = k/N, \quad (1.13)$$

we prove that $S^{(N)}(t)$ converges weakly in $C[0,T]$ to the solution of (1.8) with initial condition $S_0 := \lim_{N\to\infty} S_0^N$. Once such a result is obtained, we can prove that $x^{(N)}(t)$ converges to $x(t)$. We want to stress that the convergence of $S^{(N)}(t)$ to $S(t)$ can be obtained independently of the convergence of $x^{(N)}$ to $x$.

- Let $S(t) : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be the solution of the ODE (1.8). We will prove (see Theorem 4.1) that $S(t) \to 1$ as $t \to \infty$. With this in mind, notice that $D_\ell(1) = 2\ell^2\Phi(-\ell/\sqrt{2}) =: h_\ell$ and $\Gamma_\ell(1) = 2D_\ell(1) = 2h_\ell$. Heuristically one can then argue that the asymptotic behaviour of the law of $x(t)$, solution of (1.7), is described by the law of the following infinite dimensional SDE:

$$dz(t) = -h_\ell(z + \mathcal{C}\nabla\Psi(z)) + \sqrt{2h_\ell}dW, \quad (1.14)$$

where $h_\ell := 2\ell^2\Phi(-\ell/\sqrt{2})$. It was proved in [HAVW05, HSV07] that (1.14) is ergodic with unique invariant measure given by our target measure (1.1). Our deduction concerning computational complexity is made on the assumption that the law of (1.7) does indeed tend to the law of (1.14), although we will not prove this here as it would take us away from the main goal of the paper which is to establish the diffusion limit of the RWM algorithm.

□

### *1.2. Relation to the Literature*

We consider target measures in non-product form, when the chain is started out of stationarity. When the target measure is in product form, a diffusion limit for the resulting Markov chain was studied in the seminal paper [RGG97], where it is assumed that

$$p(x^N) = \Pi_{i=1}^N e^{-V(x^{i,N})}, \quad x^N = (x^{1,N}, \dots, x^{N,N}) \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (1.15)$$

and the potential $V$ is such that the measure $p$ is normalized. That work assumed that the chain is started in stationarity, leading to the conclusion that, in stationarity, $\mathcal{O}(N)$ steps are required to explore the target distribution. In [CRR05] the same question was

addressed in the case where $p$ is the density of an isotropic Gaussian, when the chain is started out of stationarity. Recently the papers [JLM12b, JLM12a] made the significant extension of considering the product case (1.15) for quite general potentials $V$, again out of stationarity. The work in [CRR05, JLM12b] demonstrates that the same scaling of the proposal variance is required both in and out of stationarity, in the product case, and that then $\mathcal{O}(N)$ steps are required to explore the target distribution. Again recently, diffusion limits for RWM started in stationarity have also been considered for measures in non-product form [MPS11], using families of target measures found by approximating (1.1), as we consider in this paper; once again the conclusion is that $\mathcal{O}(N)$ steps are required to explore the target distribution. In the present paper we combine the settings of [MPS11] and [JLM12b] and make a significant extension of the analysis to consider measures in non-product form, when the chain is started out of stationarity, again showing that $\mathcal{O}(N)$ steps are required to explore the target distribution.

In [RGG97] the diffusion limit is for a single coordinate of the Markov chain and takes the form

$$dX(t) = -h_\ell V'(X(t))dt + \sqrt{2h_\ell}dB(t), \tag{1.16}$$

with $X_t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $B(t)$ a one dimensional Brownian motion. Each coordinate of the Markov chain has the same weak limit. In [JLM12b, JLM12a] a similar limit is obtained for each coordinate, but because the system is out of stationarity the coordinates are coupled together, leading to a one dimensional nonlinear (in the sense of McKean) diffusion process

$$dX(t) = -d_\ell(t)V'(X(t))dt + \sqrt{2g_\ell(t)}dB(t), \tag{1.17}$$

with $X_t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $B(t)$ a one dimensional Brownian motion and

$$d_\ell(t) = \mathcal{G}_\ell[\mathbb{E}(V'(X(t)))^2, \mathbb{E}(V''(X(t)))], \quad g_\ell(t) = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\Gamma}_\ell[\mathbb{E}(V'(X(t)))^2, \mathbb{E}(V''(X(t)))].$$

The definition of the functions $\mathcal{G}_\ell$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_\ell$ can be found in [JLM12b, (1.7) and (1.6)], respectively. While we don't repeat the full definition here, we point out the two main facts which are relevant in the present context: i) in stationarity $d_\ell(t) = h_\ell$ and $g_\ell(t) = h_\ell$ and so (1.17) is identical to (1.16), but out of stationarity the variation of these quantities reflects what remains of the coupling between different coordinates in the limit of large $N$; ii) regarding the functions $D_\ell(x)$ and $\Gamma_\ell(x)$ (defined in (1.9) and (1.10), respectively), notice that $D_\ell(x) = \mathcal{G}_{\ell\sqrt{2}}(x, 1)$, $\Gamma_\ell(x) = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\ell\sqrt{2}}(x, 1)$.

In [MPS11], since the target measure is no longer of product form, the continuous interpolant of the chain $x_k$ defined in (2.3) has diffusion limit given by the solution of the infinite dimensional SDE (1.14), when the chain is started in stationarity. In contrast, in this paper where we study the same target measure as in [MPS11], but started out of stationarity, the limiting diffusion is (1.7), with $S(t)$ solving (1.8). The relationship between (1.16) and (1.17) is entirely analogous to the relationship between (1.14) and (1.7). It is natural to ask, then, why we do not obtain an infinite dimensional nonlinear (in the McKean sense) diffusion process as the limit in this paper? The reason for this is related to the fact that our underlying reference measure is Gaussian. Indeed in the case of Gaussian product measure the limiting diffusion (1.17) simplifies in the sense that the the equations for $d_\ell(t)$ and $g_\ell(t)$ depend only

on the process $X$ through the quantity $M(t) := \mathbb{E}(X_t)^2$ and it is explicitly noted in [JLM12b] that $M(t)$ solves precisely the ODE (1.8). It is also relevant to observe at this point that the weak limit $S^{(N)} \xrightarrow{d} S(t)$ has already been proven in [CRR05] in the Gaussian case where all the components $x_k^{i,N}$ are identically distributed.

On a technical note, we observe that in [JLM12b, JLM12a] the symmetry of the target measure allows the authors to employ propagation of chaos techniques so that these two papers have brought together two thus far distant worlds: MCMC and probabilistic methods for nonlinear PDEs. In our case, due to the lack of symmetry in the proposal, the propagation of chaos point of view cannot be used so we base our analysis on the more "hands on" approach used in [MPS11]. As already mentioned, the latter paper is devoted to the study of the diffusion limit for the same chain that we are analysing here and in the same infinite dimensional context as well. The difference with our paper is that the chain in [MPS11] is started in stationarity. As a consequence, the quantity that here we call $S(t)$ is, in their case, equal to 1 for every $t \geq 0$; to better phrase it, if we start the chain in stationarity, then

$$\frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{\left|x_k^{i,N}\right|^2}{\lambda_i^2} \xrightarrow{N\to\infty} 1\,, \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0. \tag{1.18}$$

Recalling that $S(t) \to 1$ as $t \to \infty$, this is coherent with our results. Although the approach we use here is similar to the one developed in [MPS11], significant extensions of that work are required in order to handle the technical complications introduced by the non stationarity of the chain. Throughout the paper we will flag up the main steps where our analysis differs from that in [MPS11] (see in particular the comments after (5.18), Remark 8.6 and Remark 8.8). Let us just say for the moment that if we start the chain in stationarity then $x_k^N \sim \pi^N$ for all $k \geq 0$. Because $\pi^N$ is a change of measure from a Gaussian measure, all the almost sure properties of the chain only need to be shown for $x \sim \pi_0$. In the non stationary case we cannot reduce the analysis to the Gaussian case and therefore some of the estimates become considerably more involved. The above discussion motivates our interest in the problem studied in this paper: on the one hand we want to extend the analysis of [JLM12b] away from the non-practical i.i.d. product form for the target; on the other hand we drop the assumption of stationarity in [MPS11].

Finally, consider the alternative proposal given, for $\beta \neq 1$, by

$$y = x + \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N^\beta}}\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\xi^N, \qquad \xi^N = \sum_{j=1}^{N}\xi^{j,N}\phi_j, \quad \xi^{j,N} \overset{\mathcal{D}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1) \text{ i.i.d.}. \tag{1.19}$$

The behaviour of the chain with this different proposal variance was studied in [RGG97, BRS09], for target measures in product form and for targets of the form considered in the present paper, respectively, when the chain is started in stationarity. In the stationary case, if $\beta > 1$ then the acceptance probability tends to one as $N \to \infty$ but the proposed moves tend to stay too close to each other, so the state space is explored very slowly. On the other hand, if $\beta < 1$ then the acceptance probability degenerates to zero. This motivates the choice $\beta = 1$. In Section 5.6 we indicate that (without proof) if the chain is started out of stationarity then analogous behaviour of the acceptance probability occurs.

We mention for completeness that the non stationary case has also been considered in [PST12, OPPS13], for the pCN algorithm and for the SOL-HMC (Second Order Langevin - Hamiltonian Monte Carlo) scheme, respectively. These algorithms are well-defined in the infinite dimensional limit and hence do not require a scaling of the time-step which is inversely proportional to a power of the dimension. On a related note, we remark that when we want to sample from measures of the form (1.1), RWM is not the optimal choice. Indeed both pCN and the SOL-HMC exactly preserve the Gaussian measure $\pi_0$ and hence, in the case $\Psi \equiv 0$, such algorithms are exact; it is for this reason that they are well-defined in the infinite dimensional limit, and do not require a scaling of the time-step with dimension. However it is still of interest to study the behaviour of RWM on measures of the form (1.1) because they provide an explicit class of non-product measures for which analysis is possible.

### *1.3. Outline of Paper*

The paper is organized as follows. In the next Section 2 we present in more detail the RWM algorithm. In Section 3 we introduce the notation that we will use in the rest of the paper and the assumptions we make on the nonlinearity $\Psi$ and on the covariance operator $\mathcal{C}$. Section 4 contains the proof of existence and uniqueness for the limiting equations (1.7) and (1.8). With these preliminaries in place, we give, in Section 5, the formal statement of the main results of this paper, Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2. In Section 5 we also provide heuristic arguments to explain how the main results are obtained. Such arguments are then made rigorous in Section 7 and Section 8, which contain the proof of Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2, respectively. The continuous mapping argument on which these proofs rely is presented in Section 6.

## 2. The Algorithm

Once the current state $x$ of the chain is given, the proposal move (1.3) depends only on the noise $\xi$. For this reason, in defining the acceptance probability for our algorithm, we can use the notations $\alpha(x, y)$ or $\alpha(x, \xi)$ indifferently. With this in mind, let us define the acceptance probability

$$\alpha(x, \xi) := 1 \wedge \exp Q(x, \xi) \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$Q(x, \xi) := \frac{1}{2}\|C^{-1/2}x^N\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|C^{-1/2}y^N\|^2 + \Psi(x^N) - \Psi(y^N). \tag{2.2}$$

Consider the Markov chain $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{H}^s$ constructed as follows

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \gamma_{k+1}\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\xi_{k+1}^N \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$\gamma_{k+1} \overset{\mathcal{D}}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(\alpha_{k+1}) \qquad \text{with} \qquad \alpha_{k+1} = \alpha(x_k, \xi_{k+1}).$$

In other words, if the chain is currently in $x_k$, the proposal

$$y_{k+1} = x_k + \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\xi_{k+1}^N$$

is accepted with probability $\alpha_{k+1}$ and rejected with probability $1-\alpha_{k+1}$. We specify that in the above

$$\xi_{k+1}^N := \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\phi_i, \qquad \text{where} \qquad \xi_{k+1}^{i,N} \overset{\mathcal{D}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1) \text{ i.i.d.},$$

and therefore the notation for $\alpha_k$ and $\gamma_k$ should actually be $\alpha_k^N$ and $\gamma_k^N$, respectively. In a less compact notation, (2.3) and (2.2) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1}^{i,N} &= x_k^{i,N} + \gamma_{k+1}\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\,\lambda_i\,\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}, \qquad \text{for } i=1,\dots,N \\ x_{k+1} &= x_k = x_0 \qquad \text{on } \mathcal{H}\setminus X^N \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$Q_k := Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|x_k^{i,N}|^2}{\lambda_i^2} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_k^{i,N}|^2}{\lambda_i^2} + \Psi(x^N) - \Psi(y^N), \tag{2.5}$$

respectively. In computational practice the above algorithm is implemented in $\mathbb{R}^N$. To be more precise let $\Psi^N(x) = \Psi(x^N)$ and consider the measure $\pi^N$:

$$d\pi^N \propto e^{-\Psi^N(x)} d\pi_0. \tag{2.6}$$

The measure $\pi^N$ coincides with $\pi_0$ on $\mathcal{H}\setminus X^N$ and it has density with respect to Lebesgue measure on $X^N$. Such a density is given precisely by

$$e^{-\Psi^N(x)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle (\mathcal{C}^N)^{-1}x^N, x^N\rangle} dx^N,$$

where we recall that in the above $x^N$ is a vector on $\mathbb{R}^N$, $x^N = \mathcal{P}^N(x)$ and $\mathcal{C}^N$ is the diagonal matrix $\mathcal{C}^N := diag\{\lambda_1^2,\dots,\lambda_N^2\}$, where the $\lambda_j^2$'s are the eigenvalues of the covariance operator $\mathcal{C}$, see (1.2). If $x_k$ is the chain defined in (2.3), then the projected chain $x_k^N = \mathcal{P}^N(x_k)$ samples from the measure $\pi^N$. Notice that the measure $\pi^N$ converges to the measure $\pi$ as $N\to\infty$ in the Hellinger metric (see [CDS10]).

## 3. Preliminaries

In this section we detail the notation and the assumptions (Section 3.1 and Section 3.2 , respectively) that we will use in the rest of the paper.

### *3.1. Notation*

Let $(\mathcal{H}, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, \|\cdot\|)$ denote a separable Hilbert space of real valued functions with the canonical norm derived from the inner-product. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a positive, trace class operator on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\{\phi_j, \lambda_j^2\}_{j\geq 1}$ be the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of $\mathcal{C}$ respectively, so that (1.2) holds. We assume a normalization under which $\{\phi_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ forms a complete orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{H}$. For every $x\in\mathcal{H}$ we have the representation $x = \sum_j x_j\phi_j$, where $x_j = \langle x,\phi_j\rangle$. Using this

notation, we define Sobolev-like spaces $\mathcal{H}^r, r \in \mathbb{R}$, with the inner-products and norms defined by

$$\langle x, y\rangle_r = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{2r} x_j y_j \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|x\|_r^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{2r}\, x_j^2.$$

$(\mathcal{H}^r, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_r)$ is a Hilbert space. Notice that $\mathcal{H}^0 = \mathcal{H}$. Furthermore $\mathcal{H}^r \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}^{-r}$ for any $r > 0$. The Hilbert-Schmidt norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{C}}$ is defined as

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 = \|\mathcal{C}^{-\frac{1}{2}} x\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-2} x_j^2$$

and it is the Cameron-Martin norm associated with the Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{C})$. For $r \in \mathbb{R}$, let $L_r : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ denote the operator which is diagonal in the basis $\{\phi_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ with diagonal entries $j^{2r}$, *i.e.*,

$$L_r\, \phi_j = j^{2r} \phi_j$$

so that $L_r^{\frac{1}{2}}\, \phi_j = j^r \phi_j$. The operator $L_r$ lets us alternate between the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and the interpolation spaces $\mathcal{H}^r$ via the identities:

$$\langle x, y\rangle_r = \langle L_r^{\frac{1}{2}} x, L_r^{\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|x\|_r^2 = \|L_r^{\frac{1}{2}} x\|^2.$$

Since $\|L_r^{-1/2}\phi_k\|_r = \|\phi_k\| = 1$, we deduce that $\{\hat{\phi}_k := L_r^{-1/2}\phi_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ forms an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{H}^r$. Function $y \sim N(0, \mathcal{C})$ can be expressed as

$$y = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \rho_j \phi_j \qquad \text{with} \qquad \rho_j \overset{\mathcal{D}}{\sim} N(0,1) \text{ i.i.d;} \tag{3.1}$$

if $\sum_j \lambda_j^2 j^{2r} < \infty$ then $y$ can be equivalently written as

$$y = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda_j j^r) \rho_j (L_r^{-1/2}\phi_j) \qquad \text{with} \qquad \rho_j \overset{\mathcal{D}}{\sim} N(0,1) \text{ i.i.d.} \tag{3.2}$$

For a positive, self-adjoint operator $D : \mathcal{H} \mapsto \mathcal{H}$, its trace in $\mathcal{H}$ is defined as

$$\text{Trace}_{\mathcal{H}}(D) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \phi_j, D\phi_j\rangle.$$

We stress that in the above $\{\phi_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an orthonormal basis for $(\mathcal{H}, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$. Therefore if $\tilde{D} : \mathcal{H}^r \to \mathcal{H}^r$, its trace in $\mathcal{H}^r$ is

$$\text{Trace}_{\mathcal{H}^r}(\tilde{D}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle L_r^{-\frac{1}{2}} \phi_j, \tilde{D} L_r^{-\frac{1}{2}} \phi_j\rangle_r.$$

Since $\text{Trace}_{\mathcal{H}^r}(\tilde{D})$ does not depend on the orthonormal basis, the operator $\tilde{D}$ is said to be trace class in $\mathcal{H}^r$ if $\text{Trace}_{\mathcal{H}^r}(\tilde{D}) < \infty$ for some, and hence any, orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}^r$.

Because $\mathcal{C}$ is defined on $\mathcal{H}$, the covariance operator

$$\mathcal{C}_r = L_r^{1/2} \mathcal{C} L_r^{1/2}$$

is defined on $\mathcal{H}^r$. With this definition, for all the values of $r$ such that $\text{Trace}_{\mathcal{H}^r}(\mathcal{C}_r) = \sum_j \lambda_j^2 j^{2r} < \infty$, we can think of $y$ as a mean zero Gaussian random variable with covariance operator $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{C}_r$ in $\mathcal{H}^r$ (see (3.1) and (3.2)). In the same way, if $\text{Trace}_{\mathcal{H}^r}(\mathcal{C}_r) < \infty$ then

$$W(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j w_j(t) \phi_j = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j j^r w_j(t) \hat{\phi}_j,$$

with $\{w_j(t)\}_{j \in \mathcal{N}}$ a collection of i.i.d. standard Brownian motions on $\mathbb{R}$, can be equivalently understood as an $\mathcal{H}$-valued $\mathcal{C}$-Brownian motion or as an $\mathcal{H}^r$-valued $\mathcal{C}_r$-Brownian motion. Throughout we use the following notation.

- Two sequences $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ satisfy $\alpha_n \lesssim \beta_n$ if there exists a constant $K > 0$ satisfying $\alpha_n \leq K \beta_n$ for all $n \geq 0$. The notations $\alpha_n \asymp \beta_n$ means that $\alpha_n \lesssim \beta_n$ and $\beta_n \lesssim \alpha_n$.
- Two sequences of real functions $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{g_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ defined on the same set $\Omega$ satisfy $f_n \lesssim g_n$ if there exists a constant $K > 0$ satisfying $f_n(x) \leq K g_n(x)$ for all $n \geq 0$ and all $x \in \Omega$. The notations $f_n \asymp g_n$ means that $f_n \lesssim g_n$ and $g_n \lesssim f_n$.
- The notation $\mathbb{E}_x [f(x, \xi)]$ denotes expectation with variable $x$ fixed, while the randomness present in $\xi$ is averaged out.

As customary, $\mathbb{R}_+ := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x \geq 0\}$ and for all $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we let $[b] = n$ if $n \leq b < n + 1$ for some integer $n$. Finally, for time dependent functions we will use both the notations $S(t)$ and $S_t$ interchangeably.

### *3.2. Assumptions*

In this section we describe the assumptions on the covariance operator $\mathcal{C}$ of the Gaussian measure $\pi_0 \overset{\mathcal{D}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{C})$ and the functional $\Psi$. We fix a distinguished exponent $s \geq 0$ and assume that $\Psi : \mathcal{H}^s \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\text{Trace}_{\mathcal{H}^s}(\mathcal{C}_s) < \infty$. In other words the space $\mathcal{H}^s$ is the one that we were denoting by $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ in the introduction. For each $x \in \mathcal{H}^s$ the derivative $\nabla \Psi(x)$ is an element of the dual $(\mathcal{H}^s)^*$ of $\mathcal{H}^s$, comprising the linear functionals on $\mathcal{H}^s$. However, we may identify $(\mathcal{H}^s)^* = \mathcal{H}^{-s}$ and view $\nabla \Psi(x)$ as an element of $\mathcal{H}^{-s}$ for each $x \in \mathcal{H}^s$. With this identification, the following identity holds

$$\|\nabla \Psi(x)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^s, \mathbb{R})} = \|\nabla \Psi(x)\|_{-s};$$

furthermore, the second derivative $\partial^2 \Psi(x)$ can be identified with an element of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^s, \mathcal{H}^{-s})$. To avoid technicalities we assume that $\Psi(x)$ is quadratically bounded, with first derivative linearly bounded and second derivative globally bounded. Weaker assumptions could be dealt with by use of stopping time arguments.

**Assumptions 3.1.** *The functional $\Psi$ and covariance operator $\mathcal{C}$ satisfy the following assumptions.*

1. **Decay of Eigenvalues $\lambda_j^2$ of $\mathcal{C}$:** *there exists a constant $\kappa > \frac{1}{2}$ such that*
$$\lambda_j \asymp j^{-\kappa}.$$
2. **Domain of $\Psi$:** *there exists an exponent $s \in [0, \kappa - 1/2)$ such that $\Psi$ is defined everywhere on $\mathcal{H}^s$.*
3. **Size of $\Psi$:** *the functional $\Psi : \mathcal{H}^s \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the growth conditions*
$$0 \quad \leq \quad \Psi(x) \quad \lesssim \quad 1 + \|x\|_s^2.$$
4. **Derivatives of $\Psi$:** *The derivatives of $\Psi$ satisfy*
$$\|\nabla\Psi(x)\|_{-s} \quad \lesssim \quad 1 + \|x\|_s \qquad \text{and} \qquad \partial^2\Psi(x)_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^s;\mathcal{H}^{-s})} \quad \lesssim \quad 1. \tag{3.3}$$

**Remark 3.2.** The condition $\kappa > \frac{1}{2}$ ensures that $\mathrm{Trace}_{\mathcal{H}^s}(\mathcal{C}_s) < \infty$ for any $0 \leq s < \kappa - \frac{1}{2}$: this implies that $\pi_0(\mathcal{H}^s) = 1$ for any $0 \leq s < \kappa - \frac{1}{2}$. □

**Example 3.3.** The functional $\Psi(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|x\|_s^2$ is defined on $\mathcal{H}^s$ and its derivative at $x \in \mathcal{H}^s$ is given by $\nabla\Psi(x) = \sum_{j\geq 0} j^{2s} x_j \phi_j \in \mathcal{H}^{-s}$ with $\|\nabla\Psi(x)\|_{-s} = \|x\|_s$. The second derivative $\partial^2\Psi(x) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^s, \mathcal{H}^{-s})$ is the linear operator that maps $u \in \mathcal{H}^s$ to $\sum_{j\geq 0} j^{2s}\langle u, \phi_j\rangle\phi_j \in \mathcal{H}^{-s}$: its norm satisfies $\|\partial^2\Psi(x)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^s,\mathcal{H}^{-s})} = 1$ for any $x \in \mathcal{H}^s$. □

The Assumptions 3.1 ensure that the functional $\Psi$ behaves well in a sense made precise in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let Assumptions 3.1 hold.*

1. *The function $\mathcal{C}\nabla\Psi(z)$ is globally Lipshitz on $\mathcal{H}^s$ and hence the same holds for the function $F(z) = -z - \mathcal{C}\nabla\Psi(z)$ :*
$$\|F(x) - F(y)\|_s \lesssim \|x - y\|_s \qquad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}^s.$$
2. *The second order remainder term in the Taylor expansion of $\Psi$ satisfies*
$$\left|\Psi(y) - \Psi(x) - \langle\nabla\Psi(x), y - x\rangle\right| \lesssim \|y - x\|_s^2 \qquad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}^s. \tag{3.4}$$

*Proof.* See [MPS11, PST11]. □

We would also like to recall that because of our assumptions on the covariance operator,
$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\xi^N\|_s^2 \lesssim 1, \quad \text{uniformly in } N, \tag{3.5}$$
if $\xi^N$ is the Gaussian defined in (1.3), see [MPS11, (2.32)].

## 4. Existence And Uniqueness For The Limiting SDE.

We now prove existence and uniqueness of the solution of the equations (1.7) and (1.8). We start with the ODE (1.8).

**Theorem 4.1.** *For any initial datum $S(0) \in \mathbb{R}_+$, there exists a unique positive solution $S(t) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ to the ODE (1.8). Such a solution is bounded with continuous first derivative for all $t \geq 0$. In particular*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} S(t) = 1$$

*and*

$$0 \leq S(t) \leq \max\{S(0), 1\}\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Before proving the above Theorem we state Lemma 4.2 below, which gathers all the properties of the real valued functions $D_\ell, \Gamma_\ell$ and $A_\ell$, defined in (1.9)-(1.12).

**Lemma 4.2.** *The functions $D_\ell(x)$, $\Gamma_\ell(x)$ and $\sqrt{\Gamma_\ell(x)}$ are positive, globally Lipshitz continuous and bounded. $A_\ell(x)$ is bounded above but not below; it has continuous first derivative on the whole of $\mathbb{R}_+$ and it is locally Lipshitz; in particular*

$$|A_\ell(x) - A_\ell(y)| \lesssim (1 + |x|)\,|y - x|\ . \tag{4.2}$$

*Moreover, for any $\ell > 0$, $A_\ell(x)$ is strictly positive for $x \in [0, 1)$, strictly negative for $x > 1$ and $A_\ell(1) = 0$.*

*Proof of lemma 4.2.* The proof of the above Lemma 4.2 follows from the same arguments used in [JLM12b, Proof of Lemma 2]. We sketch the proof in Appendix A for completeness. A plot of the function $A_\ell(x)$ for various values of $\ell$ can be found in [CRR05, page 258]. Figure 1 contains a plot of $A_\ell(x)$ for $\ell = 1$ and $\ell = 2$. □




FIG 1. *Plots of the function $A_\ell(x)$ for $\ell = 1$ and $\ell = 2$ (dashed line).*

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* Uniqueness and local in time existence for (1.8) follows by standard theory for ODEs with locally Lipshitz coefficients, see for example [JS77, Theorem A1]. We only need to show that $S(t)$ doesn't blow up in finite time and this is a consequence of the last statement of Lemma 4.2. Indeed, if we start with an initial datum $S_0 \in [0,1)$ then $S(t)$ will increase towards 1. If $S(0) > 1$ then $S(t)$ will decrease towards 1.

□

We now come to existence and uniqueness for equation (1.7), which we rewrite using the notation of Lemma 3.4 as

$$dx(t) = F(x(t))D_\ell(S(t))dt + \Gamma_\ell^{1/2}(S(t))dW(t),$$

where $W(t)$ is an $\mathcal{H}^s$ valued $\mathcal{C}_s$-Brownian Motion. The above is intended to mean

$$x(t) = x(0) + \int_0^t F(x(v))D_\ell(S(v))dv + \int_0^t \Gamma_\ell^{1/2}(S(v))dW(v)\,. \tag{4.3}$$

Also, throughout the paper the spaces $C([0,T];\mathcal{H}^s)$ and $C([0,T];\mathbb{R}_+)$ are intended to be endowed with the uniform topology.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let Assumption 3.1 hold. Then for any initial condition $x(0) \in \mathcal{H}^s$, any $T > 0$ and every $\mathcal{H}^s$-valued $\mathcal{C}_s$-Brownian motion $W(t)$, there exists a unique solution of equation (1.7) (with $S(t)$ given by (1.8)) in the space $C([0,T];\mathcal{H}^s)$.*

Before proving the above theorem, let us make a remark on the statement.

**Remark 4.4.** In the statement of Theorem 4.3 we refer to equation (4.3). With the notation introduced so far, the function $S(t)$ appearing in (4.3) is the solution of the ODE (1.8). However the proof of Theorem 4.3 is still valid if $S(t)$ is any bounded function with continuous first derivative, $S(t) : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$. □

*Proof of Theorem 4.3.* Once we prove continuity of the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} \,:\, \mathcal{H}^s \times C([0,T];\mathcal{H}^s) &\longrightarrow C([0,T];\mathcal{H}^s) \\ (x(0), W(t)) &\longrightarrow x(t) \end{aligned}$$

where $x(t)$ is defined by (4.3), existence and uniqueness for (1.7) for a small enough time interval follow from a standard contraction mapping argument, see e.g. [MPS11]. To show the continuity of such a map, let $x^\sharp(t)$ and $x^\dagger(t)$ be the images through the map $\mathcal{J}$ of the pairs $(x^\sharp(0), W^\sharp(t))$ and $(x^\dagger(0), W^\dagger(t))$, respectively. For all $0 \le t \le T$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^\sharp(t) - x^\dagger(t)\|_s \le \int_0^t \|F(x_v^\sharp)D_\ell(S_v) - F(x_v^\dagger)D_\ell(S_v)\|_s dv \\ + \|x^\sharp(0) - x^\dagger(0)\|_s + \| \int_0^t \Gamma_\ell^{1/2}(S_v)(dW_v^\sharp - dW_v^\dagger)\|_s. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the Lipshitzianity of $F$, Lemma 3.4, and the boundedness of $D_\ell$, Lemma 4.2, the overall drift coefficient of (1.7), i.e.

$$\Theta(x,S) = F(x)D_\ell(S), \quad (x,S) \in \mathcal{H}^s \times \mathbb{R},$$

is globally Lipshitz, uniformly in time. Therefore, integrating by parts in the stochastic integral, we get

$$\|x^\sharp(t) - x^\dagger(t)\|_s \lesssim \int_0^t \|x^\sharp(v) - x^\dagger(v)\|_s + \|x^\sharp(0) - x^\dagger(0)\|_s + \left\| \Gamma_\ell^{1/2}(S_t)(W_t^\sharp - W_t^\dagger) - \int_0^t \frac{d}{dv}\left(\Gamma_\ell^{1/2}(S_v)\right)(W_v^\sharp - W_v^\dagger) \right\|_s .$$

We now further work on the right hand side of the above as follows:

$$\left\| \int_0^t \frac{d}{dv}\left(\Gamma_\ell^{1/2}(S_v)\right)(W_v^\sharp - W_v^\dagger) \right\|_s \leq \sup_{v\in[0,t]} \|W_v^\sharp - W_v^\dagger\|_s \int_0^t \left| \frac{d}{dv}\left(\Gamma_\ell^{1/2}(S_v)\right) \right|.$$

Clearly,

$$\left| \frac{d}{dv}\left(\Gamma_\ell^{1/2}(S_v)\right) \right| = \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{\frac{d}{dx}\Gamma_\ell(x)}{\Gamma_\ell^{1/2}(x)} \Big|_{x=S_v} (A_\ell(S_v)) \right|.$$

From the definition of $\Gamma_\ell$ (see (1.10) and (1.12)), for any $x \geq 0$, $\Gamma_\ell$ is bounded below away from zero. Moreover, $\Gamma_\ell$ has bounded derivative (see beginning of Appendix A) and $A_\ell$, being continuous, is bounded on compacts. These facts, together with (4.1), imply the bound

$$\int_0^t \left| \frac{d}{dv}\left(\Gamma_\ell^{1/2}(S_v)\right) \right| \lesssim t, \tag{4.4}$$

hence

$$\|x^\sharp(t) - x^\dagger(t)\|_s \lesssim \int_0^T \sup_{v\in[0,t]} \|x^\sharp(v) - x^\dagger(v)\|_s + \|x^\sharp(0) - x^\dagger(0)\|_s + T \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|W_t^\sharp - W_t^\dagger\|_s. \tag{4.5}$$

Taking the supremum over $t \in [0,T]$ on the left hand side of the above gives the desired contractivity, thanks to the Gronwall Lemma, for a small enough time interval, say $[0,T_0]$ and hence a unique solution can be constructed for $t \in [0,T_0]$. Such a solution can then be extended to $t \geq 0$, thanks to the specific form of (4.5), which, we stress again, is a consequence of (4.1). Indeed, thanks to the fact that the drift of the equation is Lipshitz uniformly in time and to (4.4), the time dependence of the RHS of (4.5) will stay the same when we try and construct a solution starting from $T_0$. We will therefore be able to construct a solution over the interval $[T_0, 2T_0]$. Continuing in this way we can cover the whole real axis. This concludes the proof. □

Consider now the following equation

$$dx(t) = [-x(t) - \mathcal{C}\nabla\Psi(x(t))] D_\ell(S(t))\, dt + d\eta(t), \tag{4.6}$$

where $S(t)$ is the solution of (1.8) and $\eta(t)$ is any time-continuous noise in $\mathcal{H}^s$. Also, let $\mathfrak{S}(t) : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ be the solution of

$$d\mathfrak{S}(t) = A_\ell(\mathfrak{S}(t))\, dt + a\, dw(t), \tag{4.7}$$

where $w(t)$ is a real valued standard Brownian motion and $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a constant.

**Remarks 4.5.** Before stating the next theorem we need to be more precise about equations (4.6) and (4.7).

- We consider equation (4.7), which is (1.8) perturbed by noise, in view of the contraction mapping argument (explained in Section 6) that we will use to prove our main results. Observe that (4.7) still admits a unique solution, using for example [SV79, Chapter 10], as we are adding a Brownian noise to the stable dynamics (1.8).
- The solution to (4.7) might not stay positive if started from a positive initial datum (as opposed to the solution to (1.8), which preserves positivity). However $A_\ell$ is only defined for positive arguments, (see (1.11)). To make sense of the notation in (4.7), we extend $A_\ell$ to the negative semiaxis. In other words, the function $A_\ell$ appearing in (4.7) is not the same $A_\ell$ defined in (1.11); we should use a different notation for such a function but we refrain from doing so for simplicity. In conclusion, the function $A_\ell(x)$ in (4.7) is intended to be a strictly positive function for any $\mathbb{R} \ni x < 1$ and we fix it equal to 1 if $x \leq -1/2$; it smoothly interpolates between -1/2 and $A_\ell(0)$ if $-1/2 < x < 0$ and it coincides with $A_\ell(x)$ as defined in (1.11) if $x \geq 0$. Therefore such an $A_\ell$ will still enjoy the local Lipshitz property (4.2).
- We emphasize that (4.6) and (4.7) are decoupled as the function $S(t)$ appearing in (4.6) is the solution of (1.8). This fact will be particularly relevant in the remainder of this section as well as in Section 6.1 and Section 6.2.

□

The statement of the following theorem is crucial to the proof of our main result.

**Theorem 4.6.** *With the notation introduced so far (and in particular with the clarifications of Remarks 4.5) let $x(t)$ and $\mathfrak{S}(t)$ be solutions of (4.6) and (4.7), respectively. Then under Assumption 3.1 the maps*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_1 : \mathcal{H}^s \times C([0,T];\mathcal{H}^s) &\longrightarrow C([0,T];\mathcal{H}^s \times \mathbb{R}) \\ (x_0, \eta(t)) &\longrightarrow x(t) \end{aligned}$$

*and*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_2 : \mathbb{R}_+ \times C([0,T];\mathbb{R}) &\longrightarrow C([0,T];\mathbb{R}) \\ (\mathfrak{S}_0, w(t)) &\longrightarrow \mathfrak{S}(t) \end{aligned}$$

*are continuous maps.*

*Proof.* Continuity of the map $\mathcal{J}_1$ can be shown with a calculation in the same spirit of the one done for the map $\mathcal{J}$, so we concentrate on showing continuity of the map $\mathcal{J}_2$. To this end we will use (4.2) and (4.1). Let $\mathfrak{S}^\sharp(t)$ and $\mathfrak{S}^\dagger(t)$ be the images through the map $\mathcal{J}_2$ of the pairs $(\mathfrak{S}_0^\sharp, w^\sharp(t))$ and $(\mathfrak{S}_0^\dagger, w^\dagger(t))$, respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\mathfrak{S}_t^\sharp - \mathfrak{S}_t^\dagger\right| &\leq \left|\mathfrak{S}_0^\sharp - \mathfrak{S}_0^\dagger\right| + \int_0^t \left|A_\ell(\mathfrak{S}_v^\sharp) - A_\ell(\mathfrak{S}_v^\dagger)\right| dv + a\left|w_t^\sharp - w_t^\dagger\right| \\ &\lesssim \left|\mathfrak{S}_0^\sharp - \mathfrak{S}_0^\dagger\right| + \int_0^t \left|\mathfrak{S}_v^\sharp - \mathfrak{S}_v^\dagger\right| dv + a\left|w_t^\sharp - w_t^\dagger\right|. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can act again as in the proof of the continuity of the map $\mathcal{J}$, taking the supremum in time on the RHS first and then on the LHS and then conclude by using the Gronwall's Lemma. □

## 5. Statement of Main Theorems and Heuristics of Proofs

In this section we give a precise statement of the main results of the paper, Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2 below, and outline the heuristic arguments which are at the basis of the proof of such results. The rigorous proof of Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2 is detailed in Section 7 and Section 8, respectively, and it consists in quantifying the formal approximations presented in this section. The structure of such proofs relies on the continuous mapping argument which is presented in Section 6.

While describing the main intuitive ideas of the proof, we will also try and emphasize the differences with the analysis presented in [MPS11] in the stationary case. Here and throughout the paper we will use a notation analogous to the one used in [MPS11].

### *5.1. Statement of Main Results*

In order to state such results, we first set

$$\mathcal{H}^s_\cap := \{x \in \mathcal{H}^s : \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left|x^i\right|^2 / \lambda_i^2 < \infty\}\,. \tag{5.1}$$

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let Assumption 3.1 hold and let $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}^s$ be any point such that $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}^s_\cap$. Then the continuous interpolant $S^{(N)}(t)$ of the chain $S^N_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (defined in (1.13)) and started at $S^N_0 = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left|x_0^{i,N}\right|^2 / \lambda_i^2$, converges weakly in $C([0,T];\mathbb{R})$ to the solution $S(t)$ of the ODE (1.8) started at $S_0 := \lim_{N\to\infty} S^N_0$.*

We will prove Theorem 5.1 in Section 7.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let Assumption 3.1 hold and $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}^s_\cap$. Then the continuous interpolant $x^{(N)}(t)$ of the chain $x^N_k \in \mathcal{H}^s$ (defined in (1.5) and (2.4), respectively) and started at $x^N_0$, converges weakly in $C([0,T];\mathcal{H}^s)$ to the solution $x(t)$ of equation (1.7) started at $x_0$. We recall that the time-dependent function $S(t)$ appearing in (1.7) is the solution on the ODE (1.8), started at $S_0 := \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left|x_0^{i,N}\right|^2 / \lambda_i^2$.*

We will prove Theorem 5.2 in Section 8.

### *5.2. Formal Analysis of the Acceptance Probability*

Gaining an intuition about the behaviour of the acceptance probability $\alpha(x,\xi)$, defined in (2.1), is at the core of the proof of the main result of this paper, Theorem 5.2. We present here a formal calculation that helps gaining such an intuition.

Let us introduce the notation $\Psi^N := \Psi \circ \mathcal{P}^N$, so that $\Psi^N(x) := \Psi(x^N)$ and

$$\zeta^N_k := \mathcal{C}^{-1/2} x^N_k + \mathcal{C}^{1/2} \nabla\Psi^N(x_k), \quad \text{where} \quad \nabla\Psi^N(x_k) := \mathcal{P}^N(\nabla\Psi(x^N_k)). \tag{5.2}$$

With these definitions, we can further rewrite the expression (2.5) for $Q(x_k, \xi_{k+1})$:

$$\begin{aligned} Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) &= -\frac{\ell^2}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left|\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right|^2 - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x_k^{i,N}\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}}{\lambda_i} + \Psi(x_k^N) - \Psi(y_{k+1}^N) \\ &= -\frac{\ell^2}{N}\left|\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right|^2 - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\langle \mathcal{C}^{-1/2}x_k^N, \xi_{k+1}^N\rangle + \Psi(x_k^N) - \Psi(y_k^N) \\ &= -\frac{\ell^2}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left|\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right|^2 - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\langle \zeta_k^N, \xi_{k+1}^N\rangle + \Psi(x_k^N) - \Psi(y_k^N) + \langle \mathcal{C}^{1/2}\nabla\Psi^N, \xi_{k+1}^N\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore setting

$$r^N(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) := \Psi(x_k^N) - \Psi(y_k^N) + \langle \mathcal{C}^{1/2}\nabla\Psi^N, \xi_{k+1}^N\rangle$$

and

$$R(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) := -\frac{\ell^2}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left|\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right|^2 - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\langle \zeta_k^N, \xi_{k+1}^N\rangle, \tag{5.3}$$

we obtain

$$Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) = R(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) + r^N(x_k,\xi_{k+1})\,. \tag{5.4}$$

In [MPS11, eqn. (2.32)] it is shown that

$$\left|r^N(x_k,\xi_{k+1})\right| \lesssim \frac{1}{N}. \tag{5.5}$$

The above is true whether the chain is started in stationarity or not, as (5.5) is a consequence of the properties of $\Psi$ (see (3.4)) and of the noise $\xi_{k+1}$, see (3.5). Using (5.5),

$$Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) \simeq R(x_k,\xi_{k+1}). \tag{5.6}$$

Looking at the definition of $R$, equation (5.3), and observing that by the Law of Large Numbers

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \left|\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right|^2 \longrightarrow 1\,, \tag{5.7}$$

we deduce that $R \simeq G$ (see Lemma 7.5), where

$$G := -\ell^2 - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\sum_{j=1}^N \zeta_k^{j,N}\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}, \qquad \text{so that} \qquad G \sim \mathcal{N}(-\ell^2, \frac{2\ell^2}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \left|\zeta_k^{j,N}\right|^2)\,. \tag{5.8}$$

Recalling (5.2), we will show that

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \left|\zeta_k^{j,N}\right|^2 \simeq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\left|x_k^{j,N}\right|^2}{\lambda_j^2}$$

(see (8.42) and (7.3)), which implies $G \approx Z_{\ell,k}$, where

$$Z_{\ell,k} := -\ell^2 - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{x_k^{j,N}}{\lambda_j} \xi_{k+1}^{j,N} \quad \text{so that} \quad Z_{\ell,k} \sim \mathcal{N}(-\ell^2, 2\ell^2 S_k^N), \tag{5.9}$$

having set

$$S_k^N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\left| x_k^{i,N} \right|^2}{\lambda_i^2}. \tag{5.10}$$

In conclusion, the above formal analysis suggests that we may use the approximations

$$Q(x_k, \xi_{k+1}) \simeq R \approx \mathcal{N}\left(-\ell^2, 2\ell^2 \, S_k^N\right). \tag{5.11}$$

In [MPS11] it is proved that if we start from stationarity then the sequence $S_k^N$ converges (for fixed $k$, as $N \to \infty$) to 1 almost surely (see (1.18)). We will show that if we start the chain out of stationarity, i.e. $x_0$ is any point in $\mathcal{H}^s$, then

$$S_k^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\left| x_k^{i,N} \right|^2}{\lambda_i^2} \xrightarrow{d} S(t), \quad \text{as } N \to \infty, \ \text{ for } t_k \le t < t_{k+1}, \tag{5.12}$$

where $t_k = k/N$ and $S(t)$ is the solution of the ODE (1.8). This is the main conceptual difference between our work and [MPS11], all the other differences are technical consequences of this fact.

The approximation (5.11) dictates the behaviour of the acceptance probability. With the present algorithm the average acceptance probability does not tend to one (as $N \to \infty$, for $t_k \le t < t_{k+1}$). This is one of the disadvantages with respect to using algorithms which are well defined in infinite dimensions. Indeed, for the pCN algorithm studied in [PST11], the acceptance probability is approximately 1 if the proposal variance tends to zero with $N$.

### *5.3. Formal Derivation of the Drift Coefficient of Equation* (1.7)

Let us first clarify the use of the notation that we will make in the following. The definition of $x_{k+1}$ (2.3) contains two sources of randomness: the Gaussian noise $\xi_{k+1}$ and the Bernoulli random variable $\gamma_{k+1}$. With this in mind, when we write $\mathbb{E}_k(\cdot)$ we will mean expectation with respect to $\xi_{k+1}$ and $\gamma_{k+1}$, given $x_k$. In some cases, when we want to emphasize the fact that the expectation is taken with respect to $\xi_{k+1}$ and $\gamma_{k+1}$, we will write explicitly $\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi,\gamma}$. In the same way, if we want to stress that expectation is being taken with respect to $\xi_{k+1}$, we write $\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}$. According to (2.4), the $i$-th component of the approximate drift is given by

$$\begin{aligned} N\mathbb{E}_k(x_{k+1}^{i,N} - x_k^{i,N}) &= N\mathbb{E}_k\left(\gamma_{k+1}\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\lambda_i \, \xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right) = \sqrt{2N\ell^2}\lambda_i \, \mathbb{E}_k^{\xi,\gamma}(\gamma_{k+1} \, \xi_{k+1}^{i,N}) \\ &= \sqrt{2N\ell^2}\lambda_i \, \mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}(\alpha_{k+1} \, \xi_{k+1}^{i,N}) = \sqrt{2N\ell^2}\lambda_i \, \mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}\left[\left(1 \wedge e^{Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right) \xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

For a reason that will be clear in few lines we further split the RHS of (5.6) as follows

$$R(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) = -\frac{\ell^2}{N}\sum_{j\neq i}^{N}\left|\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right|^2 - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\sum_{j\neq i}\zeta_k^{j,N}\xi_{k+1}^{j} - \frac{\ell^2}{N}\left|\xi_{k+1}^{i}\right|^2 - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}\xi_{k+1}^{i}$$
$$=: R^i(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) - \frac{\ell^2}{N}\left|\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right|^2 - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\,, \tag{5.14}$$

hence

$$Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) \simeq R^i(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\,. \tag{5.15}$$

Using (5.15) we then have

$$\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}\left[\left(1\wedge e^{Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right)\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right] \simeq \mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}\left[\left(1\wedge e^{R^i(x_k,\xi_{k+1})-\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}\xi_{k+1}^{i}}\right)\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right]. \tag{5.16}$$

We now use [MPS11, eqn. (2.36)], which we recast here for the reader's convenience:

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let $X$ be a real valued r.v., $X\sim\mathcal{N}(0,1)$. Then for any $a,b\in\mathbb{R}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[X\left(1\wedge e^{aX+b}\right)] = ae^{\frac{a^2}{2}+b}\,\Phi\left(-\frac{b}{|a|}-|a|\right).$$

*Proof.* See [MPS11, Lemma 2.4]. □

Now notice that, given $x_k$, $R^i$ is independent of $\xi_{k+1}^i$ as it only contains the random variables $\xi_{k+1}^j$ for $i\neq j$. Therefore the expected value $\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}$ can be calculated by first evaluating $\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi^i}$ and then $\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi^i_-}$, where the latter denotes expectation with respect to $\xi\backslash\xi^i$. With this observation we can use the above Lemma 5.3 with $a=\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}$ and $b=R^i$ to further evaluate the RHS of (5.16); we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}\left[\left(1\wedge e^{Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right)\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right] &\simeq -\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}e^{\frac{\ell^2}{N}|\zeta_k^{i,N}|^2}\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi^i_-}e^{R^i}\Phi\left(-\frac{R^i}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|}-\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|\right)\\
&\simeq -\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}\,\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi^i_-}e^{R^i}\Phi\left(\frac{-R^i}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|}\right)\\
&= -\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}\,\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}e^{R^i}\Phi\left(\frac{-R^i}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|}\right)\\
&\simeq -\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}\,\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}e^{R}\Phi\left(-\frac{R}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|}\right)\\
&\simeq -\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}\,\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}e^{R}\mathbf{1}_{\{R<0\}}\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

Therefore, using the approximation (5.11) (and the notation (5.9)),

$$\mathbb{E}_k^\xi \left[ \left(1 \wedge e^{Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right) \xi_{k+1}^i \right] \simeq -\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \zeta_k^{i,N} \, \mathbb{E}_k^\xi e^{Z_{\ell,k}} \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{\ell,k}<0\}} \,. \tag{5.18}$$

The sequence of approximations (5.17)-(5.18) is done here in a different order with respect to [MPS11]. Indeed in [MPS11] the authors prove first

$$-\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \zeta_k^{i,N} \, \mathbb{E}_k^\xi e^{R^i} \Phi \left( \frac{-R^i}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \left| \zeta_k^{i,N} \right|} \right) \simeq -\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \zeta_k^{i,N} \, \mathbb{E}_k^\xi e^{R_i} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i<0\}}$$

and then

$$-\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \zeta_k^{i,N} \, \mathbb{E}_k^\xi e^{R_i} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i<0\}} \simeq -\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \zeta_k^{i,N} \, \mathbb{E}_k^\xi e^{Z_\ell} \mathbf{1}_{Z_\ell<0\}}, \quad Z_\ell \sim \mathcal{N}(-\ell^2, 2\ell^2).$$

(Notice that in the above the appearence of $Z_\ell$ rather than $Z_{\ell,k}$ is a consequence of (1.18)). Changing the order in which the above steps are performed allows to refine the estimates needed to prove the diffusion limit. Refining such estimates is needed due to the different large $N$ behaviour of $\zeta_k^{i,N}$ (see also Remark 8.6 and Remark 8.8 on this matter).

Going back to our heuristic derivation, now a straightforward calculation shows that if $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ then

$$\mathbb{E}\left(e^X \mathbf{1}_{X<0}\right) = e^{\mu+\sigma^2/2} \, \Phi\left(-\frac{\mu}{\sigma} - \sigma\right).$$

In particular this means that if $X \sim \mathcal{N}(-\ell^2, 2\ell^2 a)$, for some $a > 0$, then

$$\mathbb{E}\left(e^X \mathbf{1}_{X<0}\right) = e^{\ell^2(1-a)} \Phi\left(\frac{\ell(1-2a)}{\sqrt{2a}}\right) = \frac{1}{2\ell^2} D_\ell(a). \tag{5.19}$$

From (5.19), (5.18) and (5.9), we then get

$$\mathbb{E}_k^\xi \left[ \left(1 \wedge e^{Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right) \xi_{k+1}^{i,N} \right] \simeq -\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \zeta_k^{i,N} \frac{1}{2\ell^2} D_\ell(S_k^N) \simeq -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\ell^2 N}} \zeta_k^{i,N} D_\ell(S_k^N) \,.$$

Combining the above with (5.13) gives

$$N\mathbb{E}_k^\xi (x_{k+1}^{i,N} - x_k^{i,N}) \simeq -\lambda_i \zeta_k^{i,N} \, D_\ell(S_k^N),$$

which is the desired drift, after observing that

$$\mathcal{C}^{1/2} \zeta_k^N = x_k^N + \mathcal{C} \, \nabla \Psi^N(x_k).$$

### 5.4. *Formal Derivation of the Diffusion Coefficient of Equation* (1.7)

$$N\mathbb{E}_k(x_{k+1}^{i,N}-x_k^{i,N})(x_{k+1}^{j,N}-x_k^{j,N}) = N\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi,\gamma}\left(\gamma_{k+1}\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\lambda_i\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right)\left(\gamma_{k+1}\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\lambda_j\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right)$$
$$= 2\ell^2\lambda_i\,\lambda_j\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}\left(\xi_{k+1}^{i}\,\xi_{k+1}^{j}\,\left(1\wedge e^{Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right)\right). \tag{5.20}$$

We consider (5.3) as before but this time we split

$$R(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) = R^{ij}(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) - \frac{\ell^2}{N}\left(\left|\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right|^2+\left|\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right|^2\right) - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left(\zeta_k^{i,N}\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}+\zeta_k^{j,N}\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right),$$

where

$$R^{ij}(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) = -\frac{\ell^2}{N}\sum_{h\neq i,j}^{N}\left|\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right|^2 - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\sum_{h\neq i,j}\zeta_k^{j,N}\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}.$$

As before, $Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1})\simeq R^{ij}(x_k,\xi_{k+1})$, so that

$$\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}\left(\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\,\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\,\left(1\wedge e^{Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right)\right) \simeq \mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}\left(\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\,\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\,\left(1\wedge e^{R^{ij}(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right)\right)$$
$$= \delta_{ij}\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi^{ij}_-}\left(1\wedge e^{R^{ij}(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right) \tag{5.21}$$
$$= \delta_{ij}\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}\left(1\wedge e^{R^{ij}(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right).$$

With the same reasoning as in (5.11), we have

$$Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1})\simeq R^{ij}\approx\mathcal{N}\left(-\ell^2,2\ell^2\,S_k^N\right).$$

Now a simple calculation shows that if $X\sim\mathcal{N}(\mu,\sigma^2)$ then

$$\mathbb{E}\left(1\wedge e^X\right) = e^{\mu+\sigma^2/2}\,\Phi\left(-\frac{\mu}{\sigma}-\sigma\right)+\Phi\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right) \tag{5.22}$$

and in particular if $X\sim\mathcal{N}(-\ell^2,2\ell^2 a)$ for some $a>0$,

$$\mathbb{E}(1\wedge e^X) = \frac{1}{2\ell^2}\Gamma_\ell(a).$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}\left(e^{1\wedge R^{ij}(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right)\simeq\frac{1}{2\ell^2}\Gamma_\ell(S_k^N). \tag{5.23}$$

Putting together (5.20), (5.21) and (5.23) we get

$$N\mathbb{E}_k(x_{k+1}^{i,N}-x_k^{i,N})(x_{k+1}^{j,N}-x_k^{j,N}) = \lambda_i\lambda_j\,\delta_{ij}\Gamma_\ell(S_k^N).$$

### 5.5. *Formal Derivation of Equation* (1.8)

We now want to describe the heuristic derivation of the limit (5.12). Let us start with the drift:

$$\begin{aligned} N\mathbb{E}_k(S^N_{k+1} - S^N_k) &= \mathbb{E}_k \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{\left|x^{i,N}_{k+1}\right|^2}{\lambda_i^2} - \frac{\left|x^{i,N}_{k}\right|^2}{\lambda_i^2} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_k \left[ \gamma_{k+1} \left( \frac{2\ell^2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left|\xi^{i,N}_{k+1}\right|^2 + 2\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x^{i,N}_k \xi^{i,N}_{k+1}}{\lambda_i} \right) \right] \qquad (5.24) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_k \left[ \left(1 \wedge e^{Q(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right) \left(-2R(x_k,\xi_{k+1})\right) \right] \qquad (5.25) \\ &\overset{(5.4)}{\simeq} \mathbb{E}_k \left[ \left(1 \wedge e^{R(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}\right) \left(-2R(x_k,\xi_{k+1})\right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we just need to use the fact that $R \simeq Z_{\ell,k}$ and (5.11) and observe that if $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[-2X\left(1 \wedge e^X\right)\right] = e^{\mu+\sigma^2/2}\Phi\left(-\frac{\mu}{\sigma} - \sigma\right)(-2\mu - 2\sigma^2) - 2\mu\,\Phi\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right),$$

so that if $X \sim \mathcal{N}(-\ell^2, 2\ell^2 a)$ for some $a > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}(-2X(1 \wedge e^X)) = A_\ell(a). \qquad (5.26)$$

In conclusion we obtain $N\mathbb{E}_k(S^N_{k+1} - S^N_k) \simeq A_\ell(S^N_k)$. Showing that the diffusion coefficient for $S^N_k$ vanishes is a consequence of the calculation that we have just done, indeed

$$\begin{aligned} N\mathbb{E}_k(S^N_{k+1} - S^N_k)^2 &= \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}_k \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\left|x^{i,N}_{k+1}\right|^2}{\lambda_i^2} - \frac{\left|x^{i,N}_{k}\right|^2}{\lambda_i^2} \right]^2 \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}_k \left[ \left(1 \wedge e^R(x_k,\xi_{k+1})\right) R^2(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) \right] \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}_k \left[ R^2(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) \right] \simeq \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}_k \left| Z_{\ell,k} \right|^2 \simeq \frac{2\ell^2\, S^N_k}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

We will prove that $S^N_k$'s are uniformly bounded in $N$ and $k$ (in the sense of Lemma 7.4), hence $(2\ell^2\, S^N_k)/N \to 0$.

### 5.6. *Suboptimal Scalings for the Proposal Variance*

Consider the Random Walk algorithm with proposal (1.19), for $\beta \neq 1$. In this case the acceptance probability becomes

$$\alpha^\beta(x,\xi) := 1 \wedge \exp Q^\beta(x,\xi),$$

where, with the same reasoning leading to (5.11),

$$Q^\beta(x_k,\xi_{k+1}) =: Q^\beta_k \simeq R^\beta_k \sim \mathcal{N}(-\ell^2 N^{1-\beta}, 2\ell^2 N^{1-\beta} S^N_k). \qquad (5.27)$$

Assuming that $S_0$ is finite, one can show that $S_k^N$ remains bounded (uniformly in $k$ and $N$). Therefore, if we look at the average acceptance probability, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(1 \wedge e^{Q^\beta(x_k,\xi_{k+1})}) \overset{(5.22)}{=} \Phi\left(\frac{-\ell^2 N^{(1-\beta)/2}}{\sqrt{2\ell^2 S_k^N}}\right) + e^{\ell^2 N^{1-\beta}(S_k^N-1)}\Phi\left(\frac{\ell^2 N^{(1-\beta)/2}(1-2S_k^N)}{\sqrt{2\ell^2 S_k^N}}\right).$$

Therefore, if $\beta > 1$ the acceptance probability tends to one, if $0 \leq \beta < 1$ it tends to zero for large $N$.

## 6. Continuous Mapping Argument

In this section we explain the continuous mapping arguments that the proofs of Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2 rely on. The continuous mapping argument that we use here is analogous to the one used in [MPS11, OPPS13, PST11]. The only difference is that the drift of (4.6) is time dependent and the drift of (4.7) is not globally Lipshitz continuous.

The following Section 6.1 and Section 6.2 contain the outline of the mapping argument for the proof of Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2, respectively.

### *6.1. Continuous Mapping Argument for (4.7) (for Proof of Theorem 5.1)*

Consider the chain $S_k^N$, defined in (5.10) and let $S^{(N)}(t)$ and $\bar{S}^{(N)}(t)$ be the continuous and piecewise constant interpolants of such a chain, respectively; we recall that $S^{(N)}(t)$ has been defined in (1.13) while

$$\bar{S}^{(N)}(t) = S_k^N, \quad \text{for} \quad t_k \leq t < t_{k+1}. \tag{6.1}$$

Decompose the chain $S_k^N$ into its drift and martingale part:

$$S_{k+1}^N = S_k^N + \frac{1}{N}A_\ell^N(S_k^N) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}M_k^{2,N},$$

where

$$A_\ell^N(x) := N\mathbb{E}\left[S_{k+1}^N - S_k^N | x_k = x\right] \tag{6.2}$$

and

$$M_k^{2,N} := \sqrt{N}\left[S_{k+1}^N - S_k^N - \frac{1}{N}A_\ell^N(S_k^N)\right]. \tag{6.3}$$

To clarify the notation used in (6.2) we stress that $S_k^N$ depends only on $x_k$ (and $\mathcal{C}$). Now a straightforward calculation (completely analogous to the one in [OPPS13, Appendix A]) shows that

$$S^{(N)}(t) = S_k^N + \int_{t_k}^t A_\ell^N(\bar{S}^{(N)}(v))dv + \sqrt{N}(t-t_k)M_k^{2,N}, \quad \text{when } t_k \leq t < t_{k+1}$$

and therefore, for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$S^{(N)}(t) = S_0^N + \int_0^t A_\ell^N(\bar{S}^{(N)}(v))dv + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} M_j^{2,N} + \sqrt{N}(t-t_k)M_k^{2,N}, \quad \text{for any } t > 0.$$

Setting

$$w^N(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} M_j^{2,N} + \sqrt{N}(t-t_k)M_k^{2,N}, \tag{6.4}$$

we can rewrite the above as

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(N)}(t) &= S_0^N + \int_0^t A_\ell^N(\bar{S}^{(N)}(v))dv + w^N(t) \\ &= S_0^N + \int_0^t A_\ell(S^{(N)}(v))dv + \hat{w}^N(t)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

where, for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{w}^N(t) &:= \int_0^t \left[A_\ell^N(\bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - A_\ell(S^{(N)}(v))\right] dv + w^N(t) \\ &= \int_0^t \left[A_\ell^N(\bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - A_\ell(\bar{S}^{(N)}(v))\right] dv + \int_0^t \left[A_\ell(\bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - A_\ell(S^{(N)}(v))\right] dv + w^N(t). \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

Equation (6.5) shows that $S^{(N)}(t) = \mathcal{J}_2(S_0^N, \hat{w}^N)$. By the continuity of the map $\mathcal{J}_2$, if we show that $\hat{w}^N$ converges weakly to zero in $C([0,T];\mathbb{R})$, then $S^{(N)}(t)$ converges weakly to the solution of the ODE (1.8). The weak convergence of $\hat{w}^N$ to zero will be proved in Section 7.

Now we outline the continuous mapping argument for the chain $x_k^N$ and in doing so we shall fix some more notation.

### *6.2. Continuous Mapping Argument for* (4.6) *(for Proof of Theorem 5.2)*

We now consider the chain that we are actually interested in, i.e. the chain $x_k^N \in \mathcal{H}^s$, defined in (2.4). We act analogously to what we have done for the chain $S_k^N$. So we start by recalling the definition of the continuous interpolant $x^{(N)}(t)$, equation (1.5), and we define the piecewise constant interpolant of the chain to be

$$\bar{x}^{(N)}(t) = x_k^N \quad \text{for} \quad t_k \le t < t_{k+1}. \tag{6.7}$$

We also recall the notation $\Theta(x,S)$ for the drift of equation (1.7), i.e.

$$\Theta(x,S) = F(x)D_\ell(S). \quad (x,S) \in \mathcal{H}^s \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{6.8}$$

The drift-martingale decomposition of the chain $x_k^N$ is as follows:

$$x_{k+1}^N = x_k^N + \frac{1}{N}\Theta^N(x_k^N, S_k^N) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}M_k^{1,N} \tag{6.9}$$

where $\Theta^N(x,S) = \Theta^N(x)$ (as $S_k^N$ is defined only through $x_k^N$) is

$$\Theta^N(x) := N\mathbb{E}\left[x_{k+1}^N - x_k^N | x_k = x\right] \tag{6.10}$$

and

$$M_k^{1,N} := \sqrt{N}\left[x_{k+1}^N - x_k^N - \frac{1}{N}\Theta^N(x_k^N)\right]. \tag{6.11}$$

Using again [OPPS13, Appendix A] we obtain

$$x^{(N)}(t) = x_k^N + \int_{t_k}^t \Theta^N(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v))dv + \sqrt{N}(t-t_k)M_k^{1,N}, \quad \text{when } t_k \le t < t_{k+1}$$

and therefore, for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$x^{(N)}(t) = x_0^N + \int_0^t \Theta^N(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v))dv + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} M_j^{1,N} + \sqrt{N}(t-t_k)M_k^{1,N}.$$

Setting

$$\eta^N(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} M_j^{1,N} + \sqrt{N}(t-t_k)M_k^{1,N}, \quad \text{when } t_k \le t < t_{k+1}, \tag{6.12}$$

we can rewrite the above as

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(N)}(t) &= x_0^N + \int_0^t \Theta^N(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v))dv + \eta^N(t) \\ &= x_0^N + \int_0^t \Theta(x^{(N)}(v), S(t))dv + \hat{\eta}^N(t)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

where, for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\eta}^N(t) &:= \int_0^t \left[\Theta^N(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - \Theta(x^{(N)}(v), S(t))\right] dv + \eta^N(t) \\ &= \int_0^t \left[\Theta^N(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - \Theta(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v))\right] dv \\ &+ \int_0^t \left[\Theta(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - \Theta(x^{(N)}(v), S^{(N)}(v))\right] dv \\ &+ \int_0^t \left[\Theta(x^{(N)}(v), S^{(N)}(v)) - \Theta(x^{(N)}(v), S(t))\right] dv + \eta^N(t). \end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

If we can prove that $\hat{\eta}^N(t)$ converges weakly in $C([0,T];\mathcal{H}^s)$ to

$$\eta(t) := \int_0^t \Gamma_\ell^{1/2}(S_v)dW_v, \tag{6.15}$$

where $W_v$ is a $\mathcal{H}^s$-valued $\mathcal{C}_s$-Brownian motion, then (6.13) and the continuity of the map $\mathcal{J}_1$ allow to conclude that $x^{(N)}(t)$ converges weakly in $C([0,T];\mathcal{H}^s)$ to $x(t)$, solution of (4.3). Such an argument is the backbone of the proof of Theorem 5.2. Such a proof is the content of Section 8.

## 7. Proof of Theorem 5.1

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* Recall the definition of the map $\mathcal{J}_2$ given in Theorem 4.6 and observe that thanks to (6.5),

$$S^{(N)}(t) = \mathcal{J}_2(S_0, \hat{w}^N(t)).$$

Therefore proving the statement of Theorem 5.1 amounts to proving that $\hat{w}^N(t)$ converges weakly to zero in $C([0,T];\mathbb{R})$. This is a consequence of the decomposition (6.6) together with Lemma 7.1, Lemma 7.2 and Lemma 7.3 below. □

In the following $\mathbb{E}_{x_0}$ denotes the expected value given $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}^s_\cap$, the initial value of the chain. We recall once again that the initial value of the chain $x^N_k$ determines the initial value of the chain $S^N_k$.

**Lemma 7.1.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5.1, the martingale difference array $w^N(t)$ defined in (6.4) converges weakly to zero in $C([0,T];\mathbb{R})$.*

**Lemma 7.2.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5.1,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \int_0^T \left| A^N_\ell(\bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - A_\ell(\bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) \right|^2 dv \longrightarrow 0 \quad as \quad N \to \infty. \tag{7.1}$$

**Lemma 7.3.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5.1, for every fixed $T > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \int_0^T \left| A_\ell(\bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - A_\ell(S^{(N)}(v)) \right|^2 dv \longrightarrow 0 \quad as \quad N \to \infty. \tag{7.2}$$

Before proving the above lemmata, we state the following bounds, contained in Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 7.5, which we will repeatedly use throughout this section and the next. The proof of Lemma 7.1 can be found in Section 7.2, the proof of Lemma 7.2 and Lemma 7.3 is the content of Section 7.1.

**Lemma 7.4.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 5.1 hold. Then the following bounds hold, uniformly over $0 \le k \le [TN] + 1$:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \|x_k\|^m_s < \infty\,, \quad for\ all\ \ m \ge 1 \tag{7.3}$$

*and*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} (S^N_k)^m < \infty\,, \quad for\ all\ \ m \ge 1 \tag{7.4}$$

*Proof.* See Appendix B. □

We recall the definition of Wasserstain distance between two random variables $X$ and $Y$:

$$Wass(X,Y) := \sup_{f \in \mathrm{Lip}_1} \mathbb{E}(f(X) - f(Y))\,. \tag{7.5}$$

Notice that from the definition,

$$Wass(X,Y) \le \mathbb{E}\,|X - Y|\,. \tag{7.6}$$

**Lemma 7.5.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 5.1 hold. Recalling the definitions of $R$, $G$ and $Z_{\ell,k}$, (5.3), (5.8) and (5.9) respectively, we have*

$$Wass(R,G) \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \tag{7.7}$$

*and*

$$Wass(G,Z_{\ell,k}) \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{1+\|x_k\|_s^2}}{\sqrt{N}}. \tag{7.8}$$

*Therefore,*

$$Wass(R,Z_{\ell,k}) \le \mathbb{E}\,|R-Z_{\ell,k}| \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{1+\|x_k\|_s^2}}{\sqrt{N}}. \tag{7.9}$$

*Proof.* See Appendix B. □

### *7.1. Analysis of the Drift*

*Proof of Lemma 7.2.* Set

$$E_k^N := A_\ell^N(S_k^N) - A_\ell(S_k^N)\,. \tag{7.10}$$

Then, recalling that for any $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we set $[b] = n$ if $n \le b < n+1$ for some integer $n$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\int_0^T \left|A_\ell^N(\bar S^{(N)}(v)) - A_\ell(\bar S^{(N)}(v))\right|^2 dv = \mathbb{E}_{x_0}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=0}^{[TN]}\left|E_k^N\right|^2 \tag{7.11}$$

$$+\left(T-\frac{[TN]}{N}\right)\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\left|E_{[TN]}^N\right|^2. \tag{7.12}$$

From the above equality and observing that $\left|T-\frac{[TN]}{N}\right| < 1/N$, it is clear that in order to show the limit (7.1) it is sufficient to prove that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\left|E_k^N\right|^2 \overset{N\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0\,, \quad \text{uniformly over } \ 0 \le k \le [NT].$$

To this end, we write $A_\ell(S_k^N) = \mathbb{E}_k[(1\wedge e^{Z_{\ell,k}})(-2Z_{\ell,k})]$ (which follows from (5.26)) and use (5.25) and (6.2), obtaining

$$E_k^N = \mathbb{E}_k\left[(1\wedge e^Q)(-2R)\right] - A_\ell(S_k^N) = E_{1,k}^N + E_{2,k}^N, \tag{7.13}$$

where

$$E_{1,k}^N = \mathbb{E}_k\left[((1\wedge e^Q)-(1\wedge e^R))(-2R)\right]$$

and

$$\left|E_{2,k}^N\right| = \left|\mathbb{E}_k\left[(1\wedge e^R)(-2R) - (1\wedge e^{Z_{\ell,k}})(-2Z_{\ell,k})\right]\right|.$$

Observe that from (5.3) we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_k(R)^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{N} + \frac{\|\zeta_k\|^2}{N} \tag{7.14}$$

Using the lipshitzianity of the function $1 \wedge e^x$, (5.5) and the above, we have

$$\left|E^N_{1,k}\right| \lesssim \left(\mathbb{E}_k\|r^N\|_s^2\right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}_k(R)^2\right)^{1/2} \lesssim \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{1}{N} + \frac{\|\zeta_k\|^2}{N}\right)^{1/2}. \tag{7.15}$$

Now notice that from the definition of $\zeta_k$, equation (5.2), we have

$$\frac{\|\zeta_k\|^2}{N} \lesssim \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\left|x_k^{i,N}\right|^2}{\lambda_i^2} + \|\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\nabla\Psi^N\|^2 = S_k^N + \|\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\nabla\Psi^N\|^2.$$

It is shown in [MPS11, page 915] that

$$\|\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\nabla\Psi^N(x)\| \lesssim (1 + \|x\|_s). \tag{7.16}$$

Therefore, from (7.3) and (7.4),

$$\mathbb{E}_k\,|R|^2 < \frac{1}{N} + \frac{\|\zeta_k\|^2}{N} < \infty. \tag{7.17}$$

From (7.15) we then obtain $\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\left|E^N_{1,k}\right|^2 \to 0$.

As for the term $E^N_{2,k}$, we use the lipshitzianity of the function $(1 \wedge e^x)(-2x)$ together with the bound (7.9) to conclude

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\left|E^N_{2,k}\right|^2 \lesssim \frac{1 + \mathbb{E}_{x_0}\|x_k\|_s^2}{N} \longrightarrow 0, \tag{7.18}$$

thanks to (7.3). This concludes the proof.

□

*Proof of Lemma 7.3.* From (4.2),

$$\left|A_\ell(\bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - A_\ell(S^{(N)}(v))\right|^2 \lesssim (1 + \left|\bar{S}^{(N)}\right|^2)\left|\bar{S}^{(N)} - S^{(N)}\right|^2.$$

If $t_k \le v \le t_{k+1}$ then from the definitions (1.13) and (6.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\left|\bar{S}^{(N)}(v) - S^{(N)}(v)\right|^4 &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{x_0}(S^N_{k+1} - S^N_k)^4 \\
&\overset{(5.24)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{N^8}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\left[\sum_{j=1}^N (\xi^{j,N}_{k+1})^2\right]^4 + \frac{1}{N^6}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\left[\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{x_k^{j,N}\xi^{j,N}_{k+1}}{\lambda_j}\right]^4 \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{N^7} + \frac{1}{N^4}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}(S^N_k)^2\mathbb{E}_k\left[\sum_{j=1}^N (\xi^{j,N}_{k+1})^2\right]^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{N^3},
\end{aligned} \tag{7.19}$$

where in the penultimate inequality we have used Cauchy-Schwartz and in the last we have used the conditional (given $x_k$) independence of $x_k$ and $\xi_{k+1}$ and Lemma 7.4. Hence, using again Lemma 7.4, if $t_k \le v \le t_{k+1}$ then

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left| A_\ell(\bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - A_\ell(S^{(N)}(v)) \right|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{N^{3/2}}.$$

This implies the limit (7.2). □

### *7.2. Analysis of the Noise*

*Proof of Lemma 7.1.* By the martingale central limit theorem, all we need to prove is that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{[TN]} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left| M_j^{2,N} \right|^2 \to 0 \quad \text{as } N \to \infty.$$

From the definition of $M_j^{2,N}$, equation (6.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \frac{\left| M_j^{2,N} \right|^2}{N} &= \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left| S_{k+1}^N - S_k^N - \mathbb{E}_k[S_{k+1}^N - S_k^N] \right|^2 \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left| S_{k+1}^N - S_k^N \right|^2 + \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \mathbb{E}_k \left| [S_{k+1}^N - S_k^N] \right|^2 \end{aligned}$$

With the same calculation as in (5.24),

$$S_{k+1}^N - S_k^N = \frac{\gamma_{k+1}(-2R)}{N}.$$

Therefore, using (7.17) and $\gamma_{k+1} \le 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left| S_{k+1}^N - S_k^N \right|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \mathbb{E}_k \left| R \right|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{N^2},$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \frac{\left| M_j^{2,N} \right|^2}{N} \lesssim \frac{1}{N^2}.$$

The above allows to conclude

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{[TN]} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left| M_j^{2,N} \right|^2 \lesssim \frac{T}{N} \longrightarrow 0.$$

□

## 8. Proof of Theorem 5.2

*Proof of Theorem 5.2.* If $\mathcal{J}_1$ is the map defined in Theorem 4.6, then (6.13) means that

$$x^{(N)}(t) = \mathcal{J}_1(x_0^N, \hat{\eta}^N(t)).$$

From the continuity of $\mathcal{J}_1$, in order to prove that $x^{(N)}(t) \xrightarrow{d} x(t)$, we just need to prove that $\hat{\eta}^N(t) \xrightarrow{d} \eta(t)$, where $\eta(t)$ is the stochastic integral defined in (6.15). The weak convergence $\hat{\eta}^N(t) \xrightarrow{d} \eta(t)$ follows from Lemma 8.1, Lemma 8.2, Lemma 8.3, Lemma 8.4 and the decomposition (6.14). □

**Lemma 8.1.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 5.2 hold. Then the interpolated martingale difference array $\eta^N(t)$ defined in (6.12) converges weakly in $C([0,T];\mathcal{H}^s)$ to the stochastic integral $\eta(t)$, equation (6.15).*

**Lemma 8.2.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 5.2 hold. Then for every fixed $T > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \int_0^T \|\Theta^N(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - \Theta(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v))\|_s^2 \, dv \longrightarrow 0 \quad as \quad N \to \infty. \tag{8.1}$$

**Lemma 8.3.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 5.2 hold. Then for any fixed $T > 0$*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \int_0^T \|\Theta(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - \Theta(x^{(N)}(v), S^{(N)}(v))\|_s^2 \, dv \longrightarrow 0 \quad as \quad N \to \infty. \tag{8.2}$$

**Lemma 8.4.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 5.2 hold. Then for any fixed $T > 0$*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \int_0^T \|\Theta(x^{(N)}(v), S^{(N)}(v)) - \Theta(x^{(N)}(v), S(t))\|_s^2 dv \longrightarrow 0 \quad as \quad N \to \infty.$$

We will prove Lemma 8.1 in the next Section 8.2 and Lemma 8.2, Lemma 8.3, Lemma 8.4 in Section 8.1.

### *8.1. Analysis of the Drift*

In what follows we shall need some preliminary estimates, which we list in Lemma 8.5 below.

**Lemma 8.5.** *Let Assumption 3.1 hold and let $Y$ be a positive random variable such that*

$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}|Y|^p < \infty$ *for all* $p \geq 1$. *Then, uniformly over* $0 \leq k \leq [TN]+1$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s} \lambda_i^2 \left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^2 Y < \infty, \tag{8.3}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s} \lambda_i^2 \frac{\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^4}{N} Y \longrightarrow 0 \quad as \ N \to \infty, \tag{8.4}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s} \lambda_i^2 \frac{\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^6}{N^2} Y \longrightarrow 0 \quad as \ N \to \infty, \tag{8.5}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{\frac{c}{N}\|\zeta_k\|^2} < \infty \quad for \ all \ c > 0, \tag{8.6}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + R\right)^p} < \infty, \quad for \ all \ p \geq 1\,. \tag{8.7}$$

*We recall that* $\zeta_k^N$ *and* $R$ *have been defined in* (5.2) *and* (5.3), *respectively.*

*Proof.* See Appendix B. □

**Remarks 8.6** (On Lemma 8.5)**.** The content of Lemma 8.5 brings up one of the main differences between the stationary and the non-stationary case, so it is worth making some comments.

- If we start the chain from stationarity, i.e. $x_0^N \sim \pi^N$, where $\pi^N$ has been defined in (2.6), then $x_k^N \sim \pi^N$ for every $k \geq 0$. As already observed in the introduction, $\pi^N$ is absolutely continuous with respect to a Gaussian measure; because all the almost sure properties are preserved under this change of measure, most of the estimates of interest need to be shown only for $x \sim \pi_0$. In particular in the stationary case one has

$$\mathbb{E}^{\pi^N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_j^2 j^{2s} \frac{\left|\zeta^{j,N}\right|^p}{N^\alpha} Y \longrightarrow 0, \tag{8.8}$$

  for every $p \geq 1$ and $\alpha > 0$, uniformly over $0 \leq k \leq [TN]+1$.[1] All the differences between the analysis in [MPS11] and our analysis are a consequence of the different behaviour for large $N$ of objects of the form (8.8), which ultimately depends on this "loss of Gaussianity". For the same reason, in the stationary case the estimate (8.6) is simply a consequence of Fernique's Theorem, see [MPS11, page 916]. In our case proving such a bound requires a bit of an argument, see Appendix B.
- From the definitions (5.2) and (5.10), it is clear that proving (8.6) requires showing the uniform integrability of the double sequence $e^{S_k^N}$ (see Appendix B). Therefore, as

[1] If $x \sim \pi_0$, $x^N = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \rho^i \phi_i$, where $\rho^i$ are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$. Therefore, recalling (5.2) (see also (8.42)), one gets

$$\left|\zeta^{i,N}\right|^p \lesssim \left|\rho^i\right|^p + \|x\|_s^p.$$

(8.8) easily follows from the above as all the moments of $x_k$ are bounded in stationarity.

a consequence of Theorem 5.1 and of the proof of (8.6), we also have

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{S_k^N} \to e^{S(t)}.$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 8.2.* Set

$$e_k^N := \Theta^N(x_k^N, S_k^N) - \Theta(x_k^N, S_k^N) = N\mathbb{E}_k[x_{k+1}^N - x_k^N] - \Theta(x_k^N, S_k^N) \tag{8.9}$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \int_0^T \|\Theta^N(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - \Theta(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v))\|_s^2 \, dv = \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{[TN]} \|e_k^N\|_s^2 \tag{8.10}$$

$$+ \left(T - \frac{[TN]}{N}\right) \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \|e_{[TN]}^N\|_s^2. \tag{8.11}$$

If $e_k^{i,N}$ is the $i-$th component of $e_k^N$, the sum on the RHS of (8.10) rewrites

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{[TN]} \sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s} \left| e_k^{i,N} \right|^2.$$

The statement now follows from Lemma 8.7. □

*Proof of Lemma 8.3.* From (6.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Theta(\bar{x}^{(N)}(v), \bar{S}^{(N)}(v)) - \Theta(x^{(N)}(v), S^{(N)}(v))\|_s^2 &\lesssim \left|D_\ell(\bar{S}^{(N)})\right|^2 \|F(\bar{x}^{(N)}) - F(x^{(N)})\|_s^2 \\
&\quad + \|F(x^{(N)})\|_s^2 \left|D_\ell(\bar{S}^{(N)}) - D_\ell(S^{(N)})\right|^2 \\
&\lesssim \|\bar{x}^{(N)} - x^{(N)}\|_s^2 + (1 + \|x^{(N)}\|_s^2) \left|\bar{S}^{(N)} - S^{(N)}\right|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

having used the boundedness and Lipshitzianity of $D_\ell$ and the Lipshitzianity of $F$ (Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 4.2, respectively). If $t_k \le v \le t_{k+1}$ then from the definition (1.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \|\bar{x}^{(N)}(v) - x^{(N)}(v)\|_s^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \|(Nv - k)(x_{k+1} - x_k)\|_s^2 \\
&\overset{(2.4)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \|C^{1/2} \xi^N\|_s^2 \overset{(3.5)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{N}.
\end{aligned}$$

The above, together with (7.3) and (7.19) , concludes the proof. □

*Proof of Lemma 8.4.* Analogous to the proof of Lemma 8.3, so we only sketch it.

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \|\Theta(x^{(N)}(t), S^{(N)}(t)) - \Theta(x^{(N)}(t), S(t))\|_s^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \|F(x^{(N)})\|_s^2 \left|D_\ell(S^{(N)}(t)) - D_\ell(S(t))\right|^2.$$

Now the RHS goes to zero because of the boundedness of $D_\ell$ and the weak convergence of $S^{(N)}$ to $S$. □

**Lemma 8.7.** *Let Assumption 3.1 hold. Then* $\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s}\left|e_k^{i,N}\right|^2 \to 0$, *uniformly in* $k$. *Therefore*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=0}^{[TN]}\sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s}\left|e_k^{i,N}\right|^2 \longrightarrow 0\,.$$

*Proof of Lemma 8.7.* From the definition of $\Theta$, equation (6.8), the $i$-th component of $\Theta$ calculated at $u_k^N$ is

$$\Theta^i(u_k^N) = -\lambda_i\zeta_k^{i,N}D_\ell(S_k^N) = -2\ell^2\lambda_i\zeta_k^{i,N}\mathbb{E}e^{Z_{\ell,k}}\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{\ell,k}<0\}}\,. \tag{8.12}$$

where the second equality is a consequence of (5.19) and (5.9) . Therefore the $i$-th component of $e_k^N$ is

$$e_k^{i,N} = \sqrt{2N\ell^2}\,\lambda_i\mathbb{E}_k^\xi\left[\left(1\wedge e_k^Q\right)\xi_{k+1}^i\right] + \lambda_i\zeta_k^{i,N}D_\ell(S_k^N)\,.$$

Following the reasoning of Section 5.3, we decompose $e_k^{i,N}$ as follows:

$$e_k^{i,N} = \sqrt{2N\ell^2}\,\lambda_i\mathbb{E}_k^\xi\left[\left(1\wedge e^{R^i-\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}}\right)\xi_{k+1}^i\right] - \Theta^i(u_k^N) + e_{1,k}^{i,N} + e_{2,k}^{i,N}\,,\quad \text{where}$$

$$e_{1,k}^{i,N} := \sqrt{2N\ell^2}\,\lambda_i\mathbb{E}_k^\xi\left[\left(\left(1\wedge e^{Q_k}\right)-\left(1\wedge e^{R}\right)\right)\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right] \tag{8.13}$$

$$e_{2,k}^{i,N} := \sqrt{2N\ell^2}\,\lambda_i\mathbb{E}_k^\xi\left[\left(\left(1\wedge e^{R}\right)-\left(1\wedge e^{R^i-\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}}\right)\right)\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right]\,. \tag{8.14}$$

As already explained after equation (5.16), we use Lemma 5.3 with $a=\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}$ and $b=R^i$ and further evaluate $\mathbb{E}_k^\xi\left[\left(1\wedge e^{R^i-\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\zeta_k^{i,N}\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}}\right)\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right]$, leading to:

$$\begin{aligned}
e_k^{i,N} &= -2\ell^2\lambda_i\zeta_k^{i,N}\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi^i-}e^{R^i}\Phi\left(\frac{-R^i}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|}\right) - \Theta^i(u_k^N) + e_{1,k}^{i,N} + e_{2,k}^{i,N} + e_{3,k}^{i,N}\\
&= -2\ell^2\lambda_i\zeta_k^{i,N}\mathbb{E}_k^\xi e^R\mathbf{1}_{\{R<0\}} - \Theta^i(u_k^N) + e_{1,k}^{i,N} + e_{2,k}^{i,N} + e_{3,k}^{i,N} + e_{4,k}^{i,N} + e_{5,k}^{i,N}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$e^{i,N}_{3,k} := -2\ell^2\lambda_i\zeta^{i,N}_k\left(e^{\frac{\ell^2}{N}|\zeta^{i,N}_k|^2}-1\right)\mathbb{E}^{\xi^i_-}_k e^{R^i}\Phi\left(\frac{-R^i}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}-\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|\right)$$
$$-2\ell^2\lambda_i\zeta^{i,N}_k\mathbb{E}^{\xi^i_-}_k e^{R^i}\left[\Phi\left(\frac{-R^i}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}-\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-R^i}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}\right)\right], \tag{8.15}$$

$$e^{i,N}_{4,k} := -2\ell^2\lambda_i\zeta^{i,N}_k\mathbb{E}^{\xi}_k\left[e^{R^i}\Phi\left(\frac{-R^i}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}\right)-e^{R}\Phi\left(\frac{-R}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}\right)\right], \tag{8.16}$$

$$e^{i,N}_{5,k} := -2\ell^2\lambda_i\zeta^{i,N}_k\mathbb{E}^{\xi}_k e^{R}\left[\Phi\left(\frac{-R}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}\right)-\mathbf{1}_{\{R<0\}}\right]. \tag{8.17}$$

Now we simply set

$$e^{i,N}_{6,k} = -2\ell^2\lambda_i\zeta^{i,N}_k\left[\mathbb{E}^{\xi}_k e^{R}\mathbf{1}_{\{R<0\}}-\mathbb{E}e^{Z_{\ell,k}}\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{\ell,k}<0\}}\right] \tag{8.18}$$

and using (8.12), we have

$$e^{i,N}_k = \sum_{h=1}^{6} e^{i,N}_{h,k}\,. \tag{8.19}$$

Now that we have the above decomposition, we need to find bounds on each of the $e^{i,N}_{h,k}$'s, $h=1,\dots,6$, which is what we shall do next.

- $e^{i,N}_{1,k}$ **and** $e^{i,N}_{2,k}$ The bounds on $e^{i,N}_{1,k}$ and $e^{i,N}_{2,k}$ are straightforward:

$$\left|e^{i,N}_{1,k}\right| \lesssim \frac{\lambda_i}{\sqrt{N}} \quad \text{and} \quad \left|e^{i,N}_{2,k}\right| \lesssim \frac{\lambda_i}{\sqrt{N}}\,, \tag{8.20}$$

  The first estimate is a consequence of (5.3), (5.4) and (5.5); for the second we used the Lipshitzianity of the function $f(x)=1\wedge e^x$ and the definition (5.14).

- $e^{i,N}_{3,k}$ To study $e^{i,N}_{3,k}$, we use the simple bound $e^x-1\le x$, which holds for small $x$, and the boundedness and Lipshitzianity of $\Phi$ together with

$$\mathbb{E}^{\xi}_k e^{R^i} \lesssim e^{\frac{\ell^2}{N}\|\zeta^N_k\|^2},$$

  see [MPS11, (5.20)]. In the end we obtain

$$\left|e^{i,N}_{3,k}\right| \lesssim \lambda_i\left(\frac{\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|^3}{N}+\frac{\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|^2}{\sqrt{N}}\right)e^{\frac{\ell^2}{N}\|\zeta^N_k\|^2}. \tag{8.21}$$

• $e^{i,N}_{4,k}$ Notice that the function $f_a(x) := e^x \Phi(\frac{-x}{a})$, where $a > 0$ is some positive parameter, is Lipshitz, with Lipshitz constant $(1+a)e^{a^2}$:

$$|f_a(x) - f_a(y)| \leq c(1+a)e^{a^2} |x-y| \,, \tag{8.22}$$

where $c > 0$ is a positive constant independent of $a$. We prove the above inequality in Appendix A. For the time being, let us just use it to estimate $e^{i,N}_{4,k}$, with $a = \sqrt{2\ell^2/N} \left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|$ [2]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|e^{i,N}_{4,k}\right| &\lesssim \lambda_i \left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right| \left(1 + \frac{\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}{\sqrt{N}}\right) e^{2\ell^2 \left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|^2/N} \mathbb{E}_k \left|R - R^i\right| \\
&\overset{(5.14)}{\lesssim} \lambda_i \left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right| \left(1 + \frac{\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}{\sqrt{N}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{N} + \frac{\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}{\sqrt{N}}\right) e^{2\ell^2 \left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|^2/N} \\
&\lesssim \lambda_i e^{2\ell^2 \left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|^2/N} \left(\frac{\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}{N} + \frac{\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|^2}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|^3}{N}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.23}$$

• $e^{i,N}_{5,k}$ Acting as in [MPS11, (5.23)], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\Phi\left(\frac{-R}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}\right) - \mathbf{1}_{\{R<0\}}\right| &= 1 - \Phi\left(\frac{|R|\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{2\ell^2}\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}\right) \\
&\lesssim \frac{\left(1 + \left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|\right)}{1 + |R|\sqrt{N}} = \frac{\left(1 + \left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|\right)}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + |R|}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from the above and (8.17),

$$\left|e^{i,N}_{5,k}\right| \lesssim \lambda_i \left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right| \frac{\left(1 + \left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|\right)}{\sqrt{N}} e^{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}\|\zeta^N_k\|^2} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + |R|}. \tag{8.24}$$

• $e^{i,N}_{6,k}$ The estimate for $e^{i,N}_{6,k}$ formalizes the approximation $R \simeq Z_{\ell,k}$. Let $g(x) := e^x \mathbf{1}_{\{x<0\}}$; we recall that from [MPS11, page 923], if $X$ and $Y$ are two random variables such that $\mathbb{E}g(X)$ and $\mathbb{E}g(Y)$ are finite, then

$$|\mathbb{E}g(X) - \mathbb{E}g(Y)| \lesssim \sqrt{Wass(X,Y)}.$$

[2] Notice that we can reduce to the case $a > 0$ rather than $a \geq 0$ because if $a = \sqrt{2\ell^2/N}\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right| = 0$ this means that $\zeta^{i,N}_k = 0$, which implies $e^{i,N}_{4,k} = 0$.

Therefore using (7.9):

$$\left[\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi} e^R \mathbf{1}_{\{R<0\}} - \mathbb{E} e^{Z_{\ell,k}} \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{\ell,k}<0\}}\right] \lesssim \left(\frac{1+\|x_k\|_s^2}{N}\right)^{1/4}.$$

The above, together with (8.18), imply

$$\left|e_{6,k}^{i,N}\right| \lesssim \lambda_i \left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right| \left(\frac{1+\|x_k\|_s^2}{N}\right)^{1/4}. \tag{8.25}$$

From (8.19) and the bounds (8.20), (8.21), (8.23), (8.24) and (8.25), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \sum_{i=1}^N i^{2s} \left|e_k^{i,N}\right|^2 \lesssim\ & \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{i^{2s}\lambda_i^2}{N} \\
& + \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \sum_{i=1}^N i^{2s}\lambda_i^2 \left(\frac{\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^6}{N^2} + \frac{\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^4}{N} + \frac{\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^2}{N^2}\right) e^{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}\|\zeta_k^N\|^2} \\
& + \mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}\|\zeta_k^N\|^2} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}+R\right)^2} \sum_{i=1}^N i^{2s}\lambda_i^2 \left(\frac{\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^2}{N} + \frac{\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^4}{N}\right) \\
& + \mathbb{E}_{x_0}(1+\|x_k\|_s^2)^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N i^{2s}\lambda_i^2 \frac{\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^2}{\sqrt{N}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The result is now consequence of Lemma 8.5. □

**Remark 8.8.** Again, let us highlight the differences between the proof of Lemma 8.7 and the strategy used in [MPS11]. First of all, the chain in [MPS11] is stationary, therefore in that case there is no need of keeping track of the index $k$. That said, the two approaches are completely analogous until the step that leads to considering $e_{3,k}^{i,N}$. The two proofs differ mainly from the step that gives $e_{4,k}^{i,N}$ on. Indeed, in [MPS11], once $e_{3,k}^{i,N}$ has been controlled, the authors observe that

$$\Phi\left(\frac{-R^i}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|}\right) \simeq \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i<0\}},$$

uniformly in $i$, and then proceed to estimates similar to the one contained in $e_{6,k}^{i,N}$. In our case, because of the different behaviour of the objects contained in Lemma 8.5 (see Remark 8.6), the series

$$\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi^i} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^2 \left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^2 e^{R^i} \left[\Phi\left(\frac{-R^i}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|}\right) - \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i<0\}}\right]^2$$

would not converge. To avoid this problem we first observe that the function $e^x\Phi(\frac{-x}{a})$ is Lipshitz and postpone to $e^{i,N}_{5,k}$ the estimate

$$\Phi\left(\frac{-R}{\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}\left|\zeta^{i,N}_k\right|}}\right) \simeq \mathbf{1}_{\{R<0\}},$$

thus refining the bounds. □

### *8.2. Analysis of the Noise*

The proof of Lemma 8.1 is based on Lemma 8.9 below. In order to state such a lemma let us introduce the following notation and definitions. Let $k_N : [0,T] \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ be a sequence of nondecreasing, right continuous functions indexed by $N$, with $k_N(0) = 0$ and $k_N(T) \geq 1$. Let $\{X^N_k, \mathcal{F}^N_k\}_{0\leq k\leq k_N(T)}$ be a $\mathcal{H}^s$-valued martingale difference array (MDA), i.e. a double sequence of random variables such that $\mathbb{E}[X^N_k|\mathcal{F}^N_{k-1}] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\|X^N_k\|^2_s|\mathcal{F}^N_{k-1}] < \infty$ almost surely and $\mathcal{F}^{k-1,N} \subset \mathcal{F}^N_k$. Consider the process $\mathcal{X}^N(t)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{X}^N(t) := \sum_{k=1}^{k_N(t)} X^N_k\,,$$

if $k_N(t) \geq 1$ and $k_N(t) > \lim_{v\to 0+} k_N(t-v)$ and by linear interpolation otherwise. With this set up we state the following result.

**Lemma 8.9.** *Let $S : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ be a self-adjoint positive definite trace class operator on a separable Hilbert space $(\mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|)$. Suppose*

**i)** *there exists a continuous and positive function $f(t)$ defined on $[0,T]$ such that*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{k_N(T)} \mathbb{E}(\|X^N_k\|^2|\mathcal{F}^N_{k-1}) = \mathrm{Trace}(S)\int_0^T f(t)dt\,;$$

**ii)** *if $\{\phi_j\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$ then*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{k_N(T)} \mathbb{E}(\langle X^N_k, \phi_j\rangle\langle X^N_k, \phi_i\rangle|\mathcal{F}^N_{k-1}) = 0 \quad \textit{for all} \;\; i \neq j\,;$$

**iii)** *for every fixed $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{k_N(T)} \mathbb{E}(\|X^N_k\|^2)\mathbf{1}_{\{\|X^N_k\|^2\geq\epsilon\}}|\mathcal{F}^N_{k-1}) = 0, \qquad \textit{in probability.}$$

*Then the sequence $\mathcal{X}^N$ converges weakly in $C([0,T];\mathcal{H}^s)$ to the stochastic integral $\int_0^T \sqrt{f(t)}dW_t$, where $W_t$ is a $\mathcal{H}$-valued $S$-Brownian motion.*

*Proof.* This lemma is in the same spirit as [MPS11, Proposition 4.1 and Remark 4.2]. As observed in [Ber86, Proof of Theorem 5.1], the statement just needs to be proved for a finite dimensional Hilbert space, i.e. in finite dimensions. The first two conditions are needed to ensure the weak convergence of the finite dimensional distributions of $\mathcal{X}^N$, the last condition guarantees tightness of the sequence, see [Hel82, Theorem 3.2] and [MPS11, Remark 4.2]. □

*Proof of Lemma 8.1.* We apply Lemma 8.9 with $k_N(t) = [tN]$, $X_k^N = M_k^{1,N}/\sqrt{N}$ and $\mathcal{F}_k^N$ the sigma-algebra generated by $\{x_h^N, \gamma_{h+1}^N, \xi_{h+1}^N,\, 0 \le h \le k\}$ to study the sequence $\eta^N(t)$, defined in (6.12), in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^s$. We now check that the three conditions of Lemma 8.9 hold in the present case.

**i)** We need to show that

$$\frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{k=0}^{[TN]}\mathbb{E}_k\|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^2 \longrightarrow \int_0^T \Gamma_\ell(S(u))du\,. \tag{8.26}$$

From the definition of $M_k^{1,N}$, equation (6.11), we have

$$\frac{1}{N}\|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^2 = \|\gamma_{k+1}\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\xi_{k+1}^N - \mathbb{E}_k(x_{k+1}^N - x_k^N)\|_s^2, \tag{8.27}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}_k\|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^2 &= \mathbb{E}_k\|\gamma_{k+1}\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\xi_{k+1}^N - \mathbb{E}_k(x_{k+1}^N - x_k^N)\|_s^2 \\ &= \frac{2\ell^2}{N}\mathbb{E}_k\|\gamma_{k+1}\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\xi_{k+1}^N\|_s^2 - \|\mathbb{E}_k(x_{k+1}^N - x_k^N)\|_s^2. \end{aligned}\tag{8.28}$$

We will show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{k=1}^{[TN]}\|\mathbb{E}_k(x_{k+1}^N - x_k^N)\|_s^2 \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N\to\infty. \tag{8.29}$$

Assuming the above for the moment, let us focus on the first addend in (8.28):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{2\ell^2}{N}\mathbb{E}_k\|\gamma_{k+1}\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\xi_{k+1}^N\|_s^2 &= \frac{2\ell^2}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\mathbb{E}_k\left|\gamma_{k+1}\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right|^2 \\ &= \frac{2\ell^2}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\mathbb{E}_k\left[(1\wedge e^Q)\left|\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right|^2\right] \\ &= \frac{2\ell^2}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\mathbb{E}_k^\xi\left[(1\wedge e^{R_i})\left|\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right|^2\right] + \frac{a_{1,k}^N}{N},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$a_{1,k}^N := 2\ell^2\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\mathbb{E}_k\left[\left((1\wedge e^Q) - (1\wedge e^{R_i})\right)\left|\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right|^2\right]. \tag{8.30}$$

We now use the same technique that we used for the drift coefficient and get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{2\ell^2}{N}\mathbb{E}_k\|\gamma_{k+1}\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\xi^N_{k+1}\|_s^2 &= \frac{2\ell^2}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi_j^-}(1\wedge e^{R_i}) + \frac{a^N_{1,k}}{N}\\ &= \frac{2\ell^2}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}(1\wedge e^{Z_{\ell,k}}) + \frac{a^N_{1,k}}{N} + \frac{a^N_{2,k}}{N}\\ &= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\Gamma(S_k^N) + \frac{a^N_{1,k}}{N} + \frac{a^N_{2,k}}{N},\end{aligned} \tag{8.31}$$

having set

$$a^N_{2,k} := 2\ell^2\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\mathbb{E}_k^{\xi}\left((1\wedge e^{R_i}) - (1\wedge e^{Z_{\ell,k}})\right). \tag{8.32}$$

Therefore

$$\frac{2\ell^2}{N}\sum_{k=0}^{[TN]}\mathbb{E}_k\|\gamma_{k+1}\mathcal{C}^{1/2}\xi^N_{k+1}\|_s^2 = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=0}^{[TN]}\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\Gamma(S_k^N) + \sum_{k=0}^{[TN]}\left(\frac{a^N_{1,k}}{N} + \frac{a^N_{2,k}}{N}\right). \tag{8.33}$$

If we prove that

$$\frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{k=0}^{[TN]}\left|a^N_{1,k}\right| \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{k=0}^{[TN]}\left|a^N_{2,k}\right| \to 0, \tag{8.34}$$

uniformly over $0\le k\le [NT]$, then (8.26) follows from (8.28), (8.29), (8.33) and the above two limits. We now come to proving (8.29) and the limits in (8.34). Let us start from the latter:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\left|a^N_{1,k}\right| &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\left(\mathbb{E}_k\left|(1\wedge e^{Q}) - (1\wedge e^{R_i})\right|^2\right)^{1/2}\\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\left(\mathbb{E}_k\left|Q-R_i\right|^2\right)^{1/2}\\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\left(\mathbb{E}_k\left|Q-R\right|^2\right)^{1/2} \qquad (8.35)\\ &+ \mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 j^{2s}\left(\mathbb{E}_k\left|R-R_i\right|^2\right)^{1/2}. \qquad (8.36)\end{aligned}$$

The addend (8.35) tends to zero as $N\to\infty$ by acting as we have done for (8.13). For

(8.36) instead we have

$$(8.36) \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_j^2 j^{2s} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left( \mathbb{E}_k \left| R - R_i \right|^2 \right)$$
$$\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_j^2 j^{2s} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left( \frac{1}{N^2} + \frac{\left| \zeta_k^{j,N} \right|^2}{N} \right).$$

The first limit in (8.34) now follows from (8.3). The second limit in (8.34) can be shown analogously, using this time the bound (7.9).
To show (8.29), observe that from (8.9),

$$\|\mathbb{E}_k(x_{k+1}^N - x_k^N)\|_s^2 \lesssim \frac{\|\Theta(x_k^N, S_k^N)\|_s^2}{N^2} + \frac{\|e_k^N\|_s^2}{N^2}.$$

The desired result now follows from Lemma 8.7, and the bound

$$\|\Theta(x, S)\|_s \lesssim 1 + \|x\|_s,$$

together with (7.3).

**ii)** Condition **ii)** of Lemma 8.9 can be shown to hold with similar calculations, so we will not show the details.

**iii)** It will suffice to show that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \sum_{k=0}^{[TN]} \mathbb{E}_k(\|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^2 > \epsilon N\}}) = 0\,.$$

Using the Chebyshev and the Markov inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}_k(\|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^2 > \epsilon N\}}) \le \left( \mathbb{E}_k \|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^4 \right)^{1/2} \left( \mathbb{P}\left\{ \|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^2 > \epsilon N \right\} \right)^{1/2}$$
$$\le \frac{1}{N\epsilon} \mathbb{E}_k \|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^4\,.$$

By (8.27),

$$\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_k \|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^4 \lesssim \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E}_k \|\gamma_{k+1} \mathcal{C}^{1/2} \xi_{k+1}^N\|_s^4 + \|\mathbb{E}_k(x_{k+1}^N - x_k^N)\|_s^4\,.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \sum_{k=0}^{[TN]} \mathbb{E}_k(\|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^2 > \epsilon N\}}) \lesssim \frac{1}{N^2 \epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \sum_{k=0}^{[TN]} \mathbb{E}_k(\|M_k^{1,N}\|_s^4)$$
$$\lesssim \frac{1}{N^3 \epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \sum_{k=0}^{[TN]} \mathbb{E}_k \|\gamma_{k+1} \mathcal{C}^{1/2} \xi_{k+1}^N\|_s^4 \qquad (8.37)$$
$$+ \frac{1}{N\epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \sum_{k=0}^{[TN]} \|\mathbb{E}_k(x_{k+1}^N - x_k^N)\|_s^4\,. \qquad (8.38)$$

The addend in (8.37) can be shown to tend to zero as $N \to \infty$ by an analysis similar to the one leading to (8.31) and (8.34). The addend in (8.38) tends to zero just as a consequence of (8.29).

□

## Appendix A

Before proving Lemma 4.2, we recall the following fact, which has already been pointed out in Section 1.2.

**Remark 8.10.** For $X \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $D_\ell(X) = \mathcal{G}_{\ell\sqrt{2}}(X, 1)$, where $\mathcal{G}_\ell(X, b)$ is the drift function defined in [JLM12b, (1.7)]. Analogously, our $\Gamma_\ell(X)$ is $\Gamma_{\ell\sqrt{2}}(X, 1)$, where $\Gamma_\ell(X, b)$ is defined in [JLM12b, (1.6)]. □

*Proof of Lemma 4.2.* The boundedness of $D_\ell$ and $\Gamma_\ell$ follows from Remark 8.10 and [JLM12b, Lemma 2]. Lipshitzianity follows simply observing that both functions have bounded derivative, indeed

$$\frac{d}{dx} D_\ell(x) = \ell^2 D_\ell(x) - \frac{\ell^3}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} + \frac{1}{2\, x^{3/2}} \right) e^{-\frac{\ell^2}{4x}}$$
$$\frac{d}{dx} \Gamma_\ell(x) = \ell^2 D_\ell(x) - \frac{\ell^3}{\sqrt{\pi x}} e^{-\frac{\ell^2}{4x}}.$$

The non-Lipshitzianity of $A_\ell$ is clear once we calculate

$$\frac{d}{dx} A_\ell(x) = (\ell^2 - 2 + 2x\ell^2) D_\ell(x) + 2\ell^3 e^{-\frac{\ell^2}{4x}} \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\sqrt{\pi}}.$$

The sign of $A_\ell(x)$ is studied in [CRR05, page 258]. Finally, from (1.11) and the Lipshitzianity of $D_\ell$ and $\Gamma_\ell$,

$$|A_\ell(x) - A_\ell(y)| \lesssim (1 + |x|)\, |y - x| \ .$$

□

*Proof of* (8.22). We want to prove that the derivative of $f_a(x)$ is bounded by $(1 + a)e^{a^2}$:

$$\partial_x f_a(x) = e^x \Phi\left( \frac{-x}{a} \right) + e^x \phi_a(x).$$

where we have denoted $\phi_a(x) = e^{-\frac{x^2}{2a^2}}/(a\sqrt{2\pi})$. Because $\phi_a(x) \le 1$ for all $x \ge 0$ and $a > 0$, if $x \le 1$ then $\partial_x f_a(x) \le 2e$. If $x \ge 1$, we use the estimate

$$\Phi(-y) \le \frac{e^{-\frac{y^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(y + 1)}, \quad y > 0,$$

and act as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_x f_a(x) &\le e^x \frac{a e^{-\frac{x^2}{2a^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(x+a)} + e^x \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2a^2}}}{a\sqrt{2\pi}} \\ &\le e^x \frac{a e^{-\frac{x^2}{2a^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} + e^x \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2a^2}}}{a\sqrt{2\pi}} \\ &= e^x \frac{a e^{-\frac{x^2}{2a^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} + e^x \phi_a(x) =: g_a(x).\end{aligned}$$

By calculating the derivative of $g_a(x)$, it is easy to check that $g_a(x)$ is increasing for $x < a^2$, decreasing for $x > a^2$ and it has a maximum for $x = a^2$; because $\phi_a(x) \le 1$ for all $x \ge 1$, such a maximum is bounded above by a constant times $e^{a^2}(a+1)$. This concludes the bound on the derivative of $f_a(x)$. □

## Appendix B

*Proof of Lemma 7.4.* We shall prove the bound (7.4) explicitly, the proof of (7.3) is analogous to the one that we present for (7.4). We will repeatedly use the conditional independence of $x_k$ and $\xi_{k+1}$, which leads to

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}(x_k^{i,N}\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}) = \mathbb{E}_{x_0}\mathbb{E}_k(x_k^{i,N}\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}) = \mathbb{E}_{x_0}x_k^{i,N}\mathbb{E}_k\xi_{k+1}^{i,N} = 0, \quad \text{for all } i, N \text{ and } k\,. \tag{8.39}$$

We prove (7.4) by induction on $m$. Let us start with the inductive basis, i.e. $m = 1$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}S_{k+1}^N = \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\left|x_{k+1}^{j,N}\right|^2}{\lambda_j^2}$$

From (2.4), if the proposed move is rejected, then the chain stays in $x_k$; if instead the move is accepted we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}S_{k+1}^N &= \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\left|x_k^{j,N} + \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\lambda_j\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right|^2}{\lambda_j^2} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x_0}S_k^N + \frac{2\ell^2}{N^2}\sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{x_0}(\xi_{k+1}^{j,N})^2 + \frac{2\sqrt{2\ell^2}}{N\sqrt{N}}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{x_k^{j,N}\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}}{\lambda_j} \\ &\overset{(8.39)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{x_0}S_k^N + \frac{2\ell^2}{N} = \mathbb{E}_{x_0}S_0^N + \frac{2\ell^2}{N}[NT]\,,\end{aligned} \tag{8.40}$$

where the last equality has been obtained by iterating $[TN]$ times the relation $\mathbb{E}_{x_0}S_{k+1}^N = \mathbb{E}_{x_0}S_k^N + 2\ell^2/N$. Taking the limit on the RHS of the above equality, we obtain (7.4) for $m = 1$. The case $m = 2$ can be done analogously. Now suppose the statement is true for $m-1$ and

let us prove it for $m \geq 3$. Throughout this proof $c > 0$ is a generic constant that does not depend on $k$ and $N$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}(S_{k+1}^N)^m &= \frac{1}{N^m}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\left[\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\left|x_k^{j,N}\right|^2}{\lambda_j^2} + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{2\ell^2}{N}(\xi_{k+1}^{j,N})^2 + 2\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}}\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{x_k^{j,N}}{\lambda_j}\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right]^m \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x_0}(S_k^N)^m + \frac{c}{N^{2m-1}} \\ &\quad + \frac{c}{N^{m+m/2}}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\left(\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\left|x_k^{j,N}\right|^2}{\lambda_j^2}\right)^{m/2}\left(\sum_{j=1}^N (\xi_{k+1}^{j,N})^2\right)^{m/2} + H, \end{aligned} \tag{8.41}$$

where

$$H := \mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{\substack{h_1,h_2=0 \\ (h_1,h_2)\neq(0,0)}}^{m-1} \frac{c}{N^{m-h_1-h_2}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\left|x_k^{j,N}\right|^2}{\lambda_j^2}\right)^{m-h_1-h_2} \frac{1}{N^{2h_1+3h_2/2}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^N (\xi_{k+1}^{j,N})^2\right)^{h_1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{x_k^{j,N}}{\lambda_j}\xi_{k+1}^{j,N}\right)^{h_2}.$$

Now notice that using (8.39), the addend in the summation $H$ with $(h_1, h_2) = (0, 1)$ vanishes. So if we let

$$I := \{(h_1, h_2) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : h_1 + h_2 \leq m - 1, (h_1, h_2) \neq (0, 1), (h_1, h_2) \neq (0, 0)\},$$

we can bound the last summation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} H &\leq c\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{(h_1,h_2)\in I}(S_k^N)^{m-h_1-h_2}\frac{1}{N^{h_1+3h_2/2}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\left|x_k^{j,N}\right|^2}{\lambda_j^2}\right)^{h_2/2}\left(\sum_{j=1}^N (\xi_{k+1}^{j,N})^2\right)^{h_2/2} \\ &\leq c\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{(h_1,h_2)\in I}(S_k^N)^{m-h_1-h_2/2}\frac{1}{N^{h_1+h_2/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now use the Young's inequality to write

$$(S_k^N)^{m-h_1-h_2/2} \leq (S_k^N)^{m-1} + 1$$

and observe that because the summation in $H$ is over indices in $I$, $m - h_1 - h_2/2 \leq m - 1$ and $h_1 + h_2/2 \geq 1$. With this in mind, we have

$$H \leq \frac{c}{N}\left((S_k^N)^{m-1} + 1\right).$$

We can use the Young's inequality in a similar way to estimate the first addend in (8.41). Putting everything together we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}(S_{k+1}^N)^m \leq \mathbb{E}_{x_0}(S_k^N)^m + \frac{c}{N^5} + \frac{c}{N}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}(S_k^N)^{m-1}.$$

Now (7.4) follows from the inductive assumption, $\mathbb{E}_{x_0}(S_k^N)^{m-1} < c$, if we iterate the above inequality $[NT]$ times and let $N \to \infty$ on the RHS. □

*Proof of Lemma 7.5 .* Using (7.6), the bound (7.7) is a simple consequence of the definitions of $R$ and $G$. The inequality (7.8) follows from (5.8), (5.9), (5.2) and the bound (7.16). Indeed, denoting by $\left[C^{1/2}\nabla\Psi\right]^j$ the $j$-th component of $\left[C^{1/2}\nabla\Psi\right]$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} Wass(G, Z_{\ell,k}) &\leq \mathbb{E}_k \left| \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \zeta_k^{j,N} \xi_{k+1}^{j,N} - \sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{x_k^{j,N}}{\lambda_i} \xi_{k+1}^{j,N} \right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbb{E}_k \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left[C^{1/2}\nabla\Psi\right]^j \xi_{k+1}^{j,N} \right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left( \mathbb{E}_k \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left[C^{1/2}\nabla\Psi\right]^j \xi_{k+1}^{j,N} \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}_k \left| \left[C^{1/2}\nabla\Psi\right]^j \right|^2 \left| \xi_{k+1}^{j,N} \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} . \end{aligned}$$

In the last equality we used the conditional independence of $x_k$ and $\xi_{k+1}$. Using this fact again, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} Wass(G, Z_{\ell,k}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}_k \left| \left[C^{1/2}\nabla\Psi\right]^j \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left( \|C^{1/2}\nabla\Psi\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\sqrt{1 + \|x_k\|_s^2}}{\sqrt{N}} . \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 8.5.* From (5.2) and recalling that $\left[\nabla\Psi^N(x_k)\right]^i$ denotes the $i$-th component of $\nabla\Psi^N(x_k)$,

$$\zeta_k^{i,N} = \frac{x_k^{i,N}}{\lambda_i} + \lambda_i \left[\nabla\Psi^N(x_k)\right]^i .$$

Using the bound (7.16), for every $p \geq 1$ we have

$$\lambda_i^{2p} \left( \left[\nabla\Psi^N(x_k)\right]^i \right)^{2p} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i^{2p} \left( \left[\nabla\Psi^N(x_k)\right]^i \right)^{2p} \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i^2 \left( \left[\nabla\Psi^N(x_k)\right]^i \right)^2 \right)^p \leq 1 + \|x\|_s^{2p} .$$

Therefore for every $p \geq 1$

$$\left| \zeta_k^{i,N} \right|^{2p} \lesssim \frac{\left| x_k^{i,N} \right|^{2p}}{\lambda_i^{2p}} + (1 + \|x_k\|_s^{2p}), \tag{8.42}$$

hence

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s}\lambda_i^2\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^{2p} Y \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s}\lambda_i^2\frac{\left|x_k^{i,N}\right|^{2p}}{\lambda_i^{2p}}Y + \sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s}\lambda_i^2\mathbb{E}_{x_0}[(1+\|x_k\|_s^{2p})Y]\,. \tag{8.43}$$

Notice that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}[(1+\|x_k\|_s^{2p})Y]\sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s}\lambda_i^2 \lesssim \mathrm{Trace}(\mathcal{C}), \tag{8.44}$$

having used the assumption in $Y$ and (7.3). With this in mind, let us start proving (8.3)-(8.5).

(8.3) If $p=1$, then from (8.43) and (8.44) we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s}\lambda_i^2\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^{2p} Y \lesssim 1+\sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s}\left|x_k^{i,N}\right|^{2} Y \lesssim 1+\mathbb{E}_{x_0}Y\|x_k\|_s^p \lesssim 1,$$

having used Cauchy-Schwartz, the assumption on $Y$ and (7.3).

(8.4) If $p=2$, then from (8.43) and (8.44) we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s}\lambda_i^2 Y\frac{\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^{4}}{N} \lesssim \frac{1}{N}+\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s}\lambda_i^2\mathbb{E}_{x_0}Y\frac{\left|x_k^{i,N}\right|^{4}}{\lambda_i^4}.$$

Using the so called "Young's inequality with $\epsilon$", i.e.

$$|ab| \le \frac{|a|^q}{\epsilon}+\epsilon\,|b|^{\tilde{q}}\,, \quad \text{for all } \epsilon>0, a,b\in\mathbb{R} \text{ and } q,\tilde{q}>1 \text{ s.t. } \frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\tilde{q}}=1,$$

we can write, for some $0<\alpha<1$ to be chosen,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s}\lambda_i^2 Y\frac{\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^{4}}{N} &\lesssim \frac{1}{N}+\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\lambda_i^2 i^{2s}\left[N^{\alpha}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}|Y|^{\tilde{q}}+\frac{1}{N^{\alpha}}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\frac{\left|x_k^{i,N}\right|^{4q}}{\lambda_i^{4q}}\right]\\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{N^{1-\alpha}}+\frac{1}{N^{1+\alpha}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\|x_k\|_s^2\frac{\left|x_k^{i,N}\right|^{4q-2}}{\lambda_i^{4q-2}}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Using Young's inequality with $\mathfrak{q}'$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ and $\epsilon=1$ and again (7.3) , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s}\lambda_i^2 Y\frac{\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^{4}}{N} &\lesssim \frac{1}{N^{1-\alpha}}+\frac{1}{N^{\alpha}}+\frac{1}{N^{1+\alpha}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\frac{\left|x_k^{i,N}\right|^{(4q-2)\mathfrak{q}}}{\lambda_i^{(4q-2)\mathfrak{q}}}\\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{N^{1-\alpha}}+\frac{1}{N^{\alpha}}+\frac{1}{N^{1+\alpha}}\mathbb{E}_{x_0}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{\left|x_k^{i,N}\right|^{2}}{\lambda_i^{2}}\right)^{(4q-2)\mathfrak{q}/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Now we choose $0 < \alpha < 1$ such that $1 + \alpha = \delta + (4q-2)\mathfrak{q}/2$ for some $\delta > 0$ to be chosen later and we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} \sum_{i=1}^{N} i^{2s} \lambda_i^2 Y \frac{\left|\zeta_k^{i,N}\right|^4}{N} \lesssim \frac{1}{N^{1-\alpha}} + \frac{1}{N^{\alpha}} + \frac{1}{N^{\delta}} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} (S_k^N)^{(4q-2)\mathfrak{q}/2} \overset{(7.4)}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

One possible choice of the parameters in this proof is $\alpha = 1/2$ and $\delta = 1/4$, which leads to choosing $q > 1$ and $\mathfrak{q} > 1$ such that $(4q-2)\mathfrak{q} = 5/2$ (such an equality is satisfied for example with $q = 17/16$ and $\mathfrak{q} = 10/9$).

(8.5) Can be done analogously to the proof of (8.4).

We are left with proving (8.6) and (8.7). The latter is a straightforward consequence of (7.9) - which implies weak convergence of $R$ to a Gaussian - and the bounded convergence theorem. So we finally come to (8.6). Using (8.42) (with $p = 1$), it is clear that we only need to show

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{cS_k^N} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{\frac{c}{N}\|x_k^N\|^2} < \infty, \quad \text{uniformly over } 0 \le k \le [TN]+1, \tag{8.45}$$

for all $c > 0$. The proof of both of the above bounds can be done with a method similar to the one used for the proof of Lemma 7.4, so we only sketch the proof of the first one. By definition of $S_k^N$, equation (5.10), if the proposal move is accepted then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{cS_{k+1}^N} &= \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left[ e^{cS_k^N} e^{\frac{2c}{N}\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x_k^{i,N}}{\lambda_i} \xi_{k+1}^{i,N}} e^{\frac{c2\ell^2}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left|\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right|^2} \right] \\
&\le \left( \mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{2cS_k^N} e^{\frac{4c}{N}\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x_k^{i,N}}{\lambda_i} \xi_{k+1}^{i,N}} \right)^{1/2} \left( \mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{\frac{c4\ell^2}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left|\xi_{k+1}^{i,N}\right|^2} \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now recall that the generating function of a Gaussian random variable $X$ with zero mean and variance $\sigma^2$ is

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{tX}) = e^{\sigma^2 t^2/2},$$

while the moment generating function of a Chi-squared distribution $\chi_N^2$ with $N$ degrees of freedom is

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{t\chi_N^2}) = \frac{1}{(1-2t)^{N/2}}.$$

Using these facts we then get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{cS_{k+1}^N} &\le \left( \mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{2cS_k^N} \mathbb{E}_k e^{\frac{4c}{N}\sqrt{\frac{2\ell^2}{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x_k^{i,N}}{\lambda_i} \xi_{k+1}^{i,N}} \right)^{1/2} \\
&= \left( \mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{2cS_k^N} e^{\frac{32c^2\ell^2}{N^2} S_k^N} \right)^{1/2} \le \left( \mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{2c(1+1/N)S_k^N} \right)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

having estimated $c/N \le 1$ for $N$ large. Iterating the above inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{cS_{k+1}^N} &\le \left( \mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{2c(1+1/N)S_k^N} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\le \left( \mathbb{E}_{x_0} e^{2^2 c(1+1/N)^2 S_{k-1}^N} \right)^{1/4} \le \cdots \le e^{c(1+1/N)^{[NT]} S_0} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. □

**Acknoweldgements** The work of MO and AMS is supported by the ERC, and that of AMS additionally supported by the EPSRC.

## References

[Ber86] E. Berger. Asymptotic behaviour of a class of stochastic approximation procedures. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 71(4):517–552, 1986.

[BRS09] A. Beskos, G. Roberts, and A. Stuart. Optimal scalings for local Metropolis-Hastings chains on nonproduct targets in high dimensions. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 19(3):863–898, 2009.

[CDS10] S. L. Cotter, M. Dashti, and A. M. Stuart. Approximation of Bayesian inverse problems for PDEs. *SIAM Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 48:322–345, 2010.

[CRR05] O. F. Christensen, G. O. Roberts, and J. S. Rosenthal. Scaling limits for the transient phase of local Metropolis-Hastings algorithms. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.*, 67(2):253–268, 2005.

[HAVW05] M. Hairer, A.M.Stuart, J. Voss, and P. Wiberg. Analysis of SPDEs arising in path sampling. Part I: the gaussian case. *Comm. Math. Sci.*, 3:587–603, 2005.

[Hel82] I. S. Helland. Central limit theorems for martingales with discrete or continuous time. *Scand. J. Statist.*, 9(2):79–94, 1982.

[HSV07] M. Hairer, A. M. Stuart, and J. Voss. Analysis of SPDEs arising in path sampling. PartII: the nonlinear case. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 17(5-6):1657–1706, 2007.

[JLM12a] B. Jourdain, T. Lelievre, and B. Miasojedow. Optimal scaling for the transient phase of metropolis algorithms: the longtime behaviour. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.5517*, 2012.

[JLM12b] B. Jourdain, T. Lelievre, and B. Miasojedow. Optimal scaling for the transient phase of the random walk metropolis algorithm:the mean field limit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1210.7639*, 2012.

[JS77] D.W. Jordan and P. Smith. *Nonlinear ordinary differential equations*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1977. Oxford Applied Mathematics and Computing Science Series.

[MPS11] J.C. Mattingly, N.S. Pillai, and A.M. Stuart. SPDE Limits of the Random Walk Metropolis Algorithm in High Dimensions. *Ann. Appl. Prob.*, 2011.

[OPPS13] M. Ottobre, N.S. Pillai, F. Pinski, and A.M. Stuart. Path second order langevin diffusions and hmc algorithm. 2013. preprint.

[PST11] N. S. Pillai, A. M. Stuart, and A. H. Thiery. On the random walk metropolis algorithm for gaussian random field priors and the gradient flow. *To appear in Stochastic Partial Differential Equations, arXiv:1108.1494*, 2011.

[PST12] N.S. Pillai, A.M. Stuart, and A. Thiery. Optimal scaling and diffusion limits for the langevin algorithm in high dimensions. *Ann. Appl. Prob.*, 22(6):2320–2356, 2012.

[RGG97] G. O. Roberts, A. Gelman, and W. R. Gilks. Weak convergence and optimal scaling of random walk Metropolis algorithms. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 7(1):110–120, 1997.

[SV79] Daniel W. Stroock and S. R. Srinivasa Varadhan. *Multidimensional diffusion*

*processes*, volume 233 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979.

[Tie98] L. Tierney. A note on Metropolis-Hastings kernels for general state spaces. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 8(1):1–9, 1998.